DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 143 SO 030 289

AUTHOR Bjerstedt, Ake
TITLE Peace Education in Different Countries. Peace Education and Debate. 81.
INSTITUTION Lund Univ. (Sweden). Malmo School of Education.
REPORT NO ISSN-0479-7736
PUB DATE 88
NOTE 92p.; For a related document, see SO 030 290.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Controversial Issues (Course Content); Educational Research; Elementary Secondary Education; Foreign Countries; Global Approach; International Education; *International Educational Exchange; *International Relations; *Peace; Questionnaires; *Role of Education; Social Change; Social Studies; War; World Affairs
IDENTIFIERS *Peace Education

ABSTRACT

An attempt was made via an international questionnaire to procure information about the current situation and debate surrounding peace education in different countries. After a presentation of the questionnaire's background and composition, some general characteristic features from the response are shown. Then, a more concrete picture of the status of peace education in different countries is given through a series of illustrative responses from letters and documents. It is observed, among other things, that many countries do not have any recommendations on peace education in their official texts for schools. On the other hand, active work on this topic has begun in several countries, so it is now possible to talk about an increasing official recognition and legalization of peace education. It is often seen as a controversial topic, and the lack of research-based knowledge is quite marked. There seems to be a need to spell out more concretely the various educational goals of peace education in order to clarify agreements and disagreements. (Author/DB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

EDUCATIONAL INFORMATION AND DEBATE - 81

E BJERSTEDT

MSE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
AKE BJERSTEDT
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Peace education in different countries

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

PEACE EDUCATION IN DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

Åke Bjerstedt

An attempt has been made via an international questionnaire to procure information on the current situation and debate surrounding peace education in different countries. The Ministries of Education (or equivalent official authorities) have been contacted by letter, with the aim of getting certain questions answered, as well as obtaining text documents. After a presentation of the questionnaire's background and composition, some general characteristic features from the response material are shown. Then, a more concrete picture is given of the situation of peace education in different countries, through a series of illustrative responses from letters and documents obtained.

It is observed, among other things, that so far many countries do not have any recommendations on peace education in their official texts for schools. On the other hand, there has recently been very active work in several countries with these questions, so that it is possible to talk about an increasing official recognition and legalization of peace education. It is often seen as a controversial topic, however, and so far the lack of research-based knowledge is quite marked. There seems to be a need to spell out more concretely than has often been done various possible educational sub-goals in order to clarify agreements and disagreements.

1988
Published and distributed by:
Department of Educational and Psychological Research
School of Education, Box 23501
S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden

Printed by:
Infotryck ab, Malmö, Sweden

BACKGROUND

Children and young people receive dramatic information in the mass-media and in other ways, about the possibility of nuclear war and its horrible consequences. Many feel strong anxiety and pessimism about the future, something which is clearly reflected in the findings of several researchers (compare, for example, Ankarstrand-Lindström, 1984; Billesbølle et al., 1986; Bjurwill, 1986; Nuclear Age Education, 1986; Raundalen & Raundalen, 1986; see also the review by Davies, 1984).

In this situation, it becomes all the more urgent to ask: How should the schools deal with questions about war and peace and with the students' anxiety? Can the schools be somehow instrumental in raising the possibilities for peaceful coexistence in the future? Can they provide some form of peace education? What specific goals should this involve? Which methods would be relevant?

In Sweden, these questions have become the subject of increasing interest, both in the more "traditional" peace movements and in the newer occupational groups for peace (Teachers for Peace, Psychologists Against Nuclear Weapons, Swedish Doctors Against Nuclear Weapons, etc.). In our country, however, peace questions have been pursued not only at the grassroots level. Politicians in central positions such as Olof Palme and Alva Myrdal can be characterized as "peace workers", interested in the possibilities in the schools (compare, for example, Myrdal, 1980). The central school administrators, Skolöverstyrelsen, have stimulated activities in the area school and peace, through the declaration of principles and conference initiatives (compare Thelin, 1986; Thelin & the Project for Peace Preparedness, 1986).

The questions above as to how the schools should handle the problems around war and peace are by no means simple. Any agreement about what is wanted with a peace-related education can hardly be said to exist; and even if we were to come to an agreement about the goals, then

which methods provide the best direction towards these goals? In other words, a difficult and controversial area. We need to discuss these questions on a more concrete level than has been done in the past, and we need to gather information and experience through research and systematic development.

In this situation, I believe that it is also important for any single country to learn from other countries' experience, to listen to the debate and proposed measures in other parts of the world. We can possibly capture some new ideas and avoid pitfalls by learning from the earlier mistakes of others. It can also be worthwhile to examine our own debate on these questions against a wider international background. Modern war is to an extraordinary degree a phenomenon with possible global consequences, and it is important to co-operate across borders in every peace-building activity. We need an Educational International for Peace.

Against the background of this need of knowledge, I have tried in various ways to gather information about the current situation and the current debate on peace education in different countries, partly through the flowering diversity of reports, books and articles on the subject, and partly through an international questionnarie (cf Bjerstedt, 1987).

An inventory of the literature has recently been made and collections of abstracts in English and Swedish published (Bjerstedt & Gustafsson, 1986; Bjerstedt, Gustafsson & Rosenqvist, 1987). Moreover, we want to report on some of the more important international publications and to comment on these in a somewhat more detailed way in pamphlet form (see, for example, Berg, 1986a, 1986b; Rosenqvist, 1986, 1987; Svensson, 1986, 1988).

Preliminary findings from the international questionnaire were presented at an international Peace Research Conference in April, 1986 (The International Peace Research Association, University of Sussex; compare with Bjerstedt, 1986b). I will give below a somewhat more detailed

report on the results of the questionnaire.

The Swedish National Board of Education and the University of Lund have donated economic assistance for this research. Valuable viewpoints on a preliminary Swedish version of this report have been rendered by Gunnel Ankarstrand-Lindström, Evy Gustafsson, Jerry Rosenqvist and Bengt Thelin.

THE INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE

An international questionnaire on peace education issues can be formed in many ways and directed to addressees of different categories. In the present case, it was decided to appeal to the official school authorities in various countries, as it seemed interesting to determine whether these authorities had given any form of written authorization for the handling of peace questions in the schools. We proposed to contact the Education Ministry (or equivalent official bureau) in each country by letter and request answers to some short questions related to peace education.

I asked Bengt Thelin, Educational Adviser to the Swedish National Board of Education, to join me as co-signer to the written appeal to the Education Ministers, and the letters were sent out on the Board's international stationary. A copy of the letter appears in Box 1.

The questionnaire itself was formed (in consultation with Bengt Thelin) in the way in which it appears in Box 2. The thought was that it should be kept short and simple, concentrating on three main questions. At the same time, the addressees should be requested to send supplementary information in the form of official texts, debate articles, guidebooks and the like, which would make it possible to obtain a multi-faceted and concrete picture.

An attempt was made to reach most "geographic units" in Europe and North America and, beyond that, to send the letter to a smaller number of countries outside those regions.

In many countries, school matters are not dealt with by the national ministry, but by regional authorities. This applies to England and West Germany, for example. In these cases, the questions have been sent to the relevant authority, as exemplified by the different states of West Germany, or a sample of local educational authorities in England.

The work of getting correct and current addresses was facilitated by the willing help of department secretary Kristina Hansson-Mueller. Furthermore, the author gathered certain information from the library of the Foreign Policy Institute in Stockholm and from the American Embassy's library in Copenhagen. Current addresses for the English local education authorities were obtained from the Department of Education and Sciences in London.

From these starting points, about 140 questionnaires were sent out at the end of 1985 and beginning of 1986.

The ministries and other administrative authorities have many urgent duties, and there was reason to expect that replies to this type of odd questionnaire, from another country, would not be sent immediately. We were also prepared for a number of letters being thrown in the trash or put on the shelf marked "less urgent questions". However, responses have slowly come in, and many addressees have gone to great length to write detailed replies as well as to include interesting documents of many sorts.

In the beginning of April, 1986, I made a first examination of responses (on the eve of the above-mentioned congress at the University of Sussex, with the International Peace Research Association). At that time, 75 "independent" replies had come in (in some cases, more than one response had come in from the same country, or from higher as well as subordinate authorities; such "doubled" replies are not included in the tables of this study). When I made a new review of the responses in November, 1986, for a more detailed report in Swedish, 121 independent replies had come in.

In Appendix 1, an overview is given of letters sent and responses received. It is seen that a few more replies have come in after the November 1986 analysis was made. Since these few additional letters could not change the general pattern of results, I have chosen not to recalculate the tables from the Swedish report. In the present English report, the main analyses will therefore deal with the first 121 independent replies to arrive.

Box 1.

Letter accompanying the international questionnaire

SWEDISH NATIONAL
BOARD OF EDUCATION

Dr Bengt Thelin

INFORMATION REQUEST
December 6, 1985

In Sweden, as in many other countries, there is currently a debate dealing with to what extent and in what forms schools should include peace education.

In our work with this problem area, it would be very helpful to be informed about the situation in your country in this respect. We would be very grateful if you would kindly send us some answers and some relevant information materials related to our questions on the page enclosed.

Your answers and materials should be sent to Professor Åke Bjerstedt at the address given below.

Thanking you in advance for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Bengt Thelin
Head of Division
The National Board of Education
S-106 42 STOCKHOLM
SWEDEN

Åke Bjerstedt
Professor of Education
School of Education
Box 23501
S-200 45 MALMÖ
SWEDEN

Postal address
S-106 42 STOCKHOLM
Sweden

Visiting address
Kungsgatan 43
STOCKHOLM

Telephone
Nat 08 783 20 00
Int +46 8 783 20 00

Postal account
15655 4

Box 2.

The international questionnaire

THE SWEDISH NATIONAL BOARD OF EDUCATION
STOCKHOLM

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL AND PSYCHOLOGICAL RESEARCH
SCHOOL OF EDUCATION, MALMÖ

QUESTIONS ON PEACE EDUCATION

1) Do you presently have some explicit recommendations in offical documents for schools in your country that the teaching should include questions of peace or "peace education"?

Yes___ No___ Other answer:

If some such text exists, we would be grateful to get a copy of it, if possible.

2) Do you know of some instructional materials for school pupils or manuals for teachers in your country dealing explicitly with peace education?

Yes___ No___ Other answer:

If such materials or manuals exist, could you give us references to these publications (authors, titles, publishers) or could you send us copies?

3) Has there, in your country, been some recent public discussion on the topic of peace education (for example, in newspapers or in educational journals)?

Yes___ No___ Other answer:

If yes, could you give us some indication of what kind of issues have been primarily discussed? Could you give us references to such discussion articles (titles, journals, dates) or could you send us copies?

If yes, could you give us the name and address of some prominent discussant being in favor of peace education in your country?

Please note: Answers and materials should be sent to Prof. Åke Bjerstedt, School of Education, Box 23501, S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden.
Even if your answers to the main questions above should be "No", we would still like to hear from you.

SOME GENERAL CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF THE RESPONSE MATERIAL

To begin with, I want to describe some general features in the response material. In Box 3 I have summarized some basic information from the 121 independent geographic units (countries, states etc.). In notes to the tables included, I give further details as to who the respondents are.

In addition, some simple supplementary percentage calculations are shown in Box 4, intended to facilitate certain comparisons between groups of countries.

I will comment below on certain aspects of the material, using partly the information from the two boxes mentioned, and partly more general observations made when examining the materials collected.

1) The first question asked was whether or not the country had included some explicit recommendations in official documents for the schools that the teaching should include questions of peace or "peace education". Out of the 121 responding ministries or other official bodies, 55 answered No, while 34 said Yes and 32 gave some other kind of answer (for example, that peace education was not explicitly mentioned in official school texts, but that there were recommendations to include global perspectives and international relations). Evidently many countries still have no explicit official recommendations in this important area. Excluding the varying kinds of "other answers", we find a No-Yes proportion of 62 % No versus 38 % Yes. This indicates that we still have a long way to go, before peace education is generally seen as a normal and important element in the school systems.

2) On the other hand, there is also reason to note that in spite of the predominance of No answers, there are quite a few clear Yes answers as well. The official texts which the Yes answers refer to are quite varied in scope and concretion. But it could be noted as a hopeful indication that many countries and states have

Box 3.

Overview of answers on peace education from 121 geographical areas (countries, states etc.): Peace Education Official Status (Question 1), Peace Education Materials (Question 2), and Peace Education Debate (Question 3).

Question 1: Do you presently have some explicit recommendations in official documents for schools in your country that the teaching should include questions of peace or "peace education"?

	Yes	No	Other answer
Europe (n=47)	20	10	17
United States (n=43)	4	34	5
Others (n=31)	10	11	10
Total (n=121)	34	55	32
Percentage Yes/No	38%	62%	

Question 2: Do you know of some instructional materials for school pupils or manuals for teachers in your country dealing explicitly with peace education?

	Yes	No	Other answer
Europe (n=47)	19	6	22
United States (n=43)	22	17	4
Others (n=31)	9	10	12
Total (n=121)	50	33	38
Percentage Yes/No	60%	40%	

Question 3: Has there, in your country, been some recent public discussion on the topic of peace education (for example, in newspapers or in educational journals)?

	Yes	No	Other answer
Europe (n=47)	23	7	17
United States (n=43)	27	9	7
Others (n=31)	14	6	11
Total (n=121)	64	22	35
Percentage Yes/No	74%	26%	

Box 3. (Continued)

Explanatory Notes

1. The figures in the table are based upon 121 independent answers to our questionnaire (which means that answers from federal authorities have been excluded).

2. Answers for Europe include the following countries so far: Austria; Belgium: Flemish region; Belgium: French region; Cyprus; Czechoslovakia; DDR; Denmark; Finland; France; Greece; Iceland; Ireland; Liechtenstein; Luxembourg; The Netherlands; Northern Ireland; Norway; Poland; Portugal; Scotland; Soviet Union; Spain; Sweden; Switzerland; Turkey; Yugoslavia; Wales. - In the Federal Republic of Germany, BRD, the separate "Länder" deal with the school curriculum independently. Separate answers have been obtained from these: Baden-Württemburg, Bayern, Berlin, Bremen, Hamburg, Hessen, Niedersachsen, Nordrhein-Westfalen, Rheinland-Pfalz, Saarland, Schleswig-Holstein. - In England, finally, the authority on school affairs rests with local education authorities (LEAs). Ten of these have been approached, and answers have so far been received from: Avon, Birmingham, Inner London, Leeds, Leicestershire, Manchester, Newcastle upon Tyne, Nottinghamshire, Sheffield.

3. In the United States, educational matters are handled by Departments of Education in the separate states. Answers have so far been received from: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Lousiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Maryland, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin, Wyoming.

4. Whereas an attempt was made to reach most geographical units of Europe and the United States, other countries were approached more selectively. So far the following units have answered: Alberta, Australian Capital Territory, Brazil, British Columbia, Chile, Costa Rica, India, Israel, Japan, Manitoba, New Brunswick, New Foundland, New South Wales, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Northern Australia, Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Pakistan, Peru, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Saskatchewan, South Australia, Tanzania, Tasmania, Victoria, Western Australia, the Yukon, Zimbabwe.

5. For a more complete overview of the addressees and the replies, see Appendix 1.

Box 4.

Comparison between Europe, the United States and other countries: The Yes/No proportion as to the questions on Peace Education Official States (Question 1), Peace Education Materials (Question 2), and Peace Education Debate (Question 3). The category "Other answer" has not been included here.

	Percentage Distribution		Raw Scores	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Question 1				
Europe	67	33	20	10
United States	11	89	4	34
Others	48	52	10	11
Question 2				
Europe	76	24	19	6
United States	56	44	22	17
Others	47	33	9	10
Question 3				
Europe	77	23	23	7
United States	75	25	27	9
Others	70	30	14	6

Note:

1. The wording of the questions has been rendered above (see, for example, Box 3).
2. The percentages have been calculated on low numbers; only more conspicuous differences of percentage should be noted.

had special committees with the task to draw up recommendations within the field of peace education, and that several of these texts are quite recent and detailed. Some of the answering countries have also communicated that such projects are in progress, but that the documents are not yet ready for publication. It is evident that people in a good number of countries have actively worked with these questions lately, something which has meant new official recognition and legitimization of peace-oriented activities in schools.

3) The second question of the questionnaire (see Box 2) dealt with the existence of instructional materials for school pupils or manuals for teachers within the peace education field. In this case, the percentage of Yes answers is higher than in the case of official recommendations, and quite a few of the answers give concrete examples or enclose materials. Often such teaching materials or teachers' guides were developed by special-interest groups, such as the active "Educators for Social Responsibility" in the United States, and then used by a broader circle of teachers. The method of shaping "instrumental models" for an educational field which is new to many teachers can be a good method to promote work within this field. In certain cases, the educational material has been developed and tested with the help of more or less systematic evaluation (for example, "Choices", 1983). Up until now, however, this seems to be the exception rather than the rule. There are rich opportunities here for educational research and development, as it is important to evaluate to what extent the existing materials really are good instruments in reaching the objectives desired. Betty Reardon of Teachers College, Columbia University, New York - one of those who has probably the best general view in the U.S.A. of teaching materials and teaching aids in this field - recently said in a personal interview that a great abundance

of peace-oriented textbooks and teaching materials are available in the U.S.A., but that a good deal of it is of low quality.

4) The last question of the questionnaire concerned the occurrence of recent public debate about peace education in newspapers and educational reviews, for example. It is here that we come across the most positive Yes-No proportion, with about 75 % Yes answers. Certain answering countries also forwarded various articles and newspaper clippings which exemplified the kind of debate that had been going on. On the one hand, current and lively debate can be a positive sign: peace-related education is obviously an issue that attracts considerable attention, something which can also stimulate concrete action and development. On the other hand, in certain countries we observe a phenomenon that can be regarded as overheated discussion, that is to say, a debate where political and ideological antagonism has led to prejudice and difficulties in fruitful communication. In West Germany we can see an example of positive as well as negative consequences of a lively debate. Information on the West German debate, with abundent documentation, is presented in the German book, "Weder Wehrkunde noch Friedenserziehung?" (Lutz, 1984).

5) The simple percentage calculations presented in Box 4 facilitate certain comparisons between groups of countries. What is very evident here is the unique position of the European countries in regard to the answers to Questions 1 and 2. Whereas the three groups have a similar distribution of answers to the third question, the proportion of Yes-answers from the European countries is considerably higher than that for the United States or for the remaining countries in regard to the first two questions. Regarding the occurrence of teaching materials or teaching guides, the European group answers Yes in 76 %, as opposed to

56 % and 47 % for the other two groups. And regarding the occurrence of official recommendations, the difference between Europe and the United States is even more marked (67 % Yes in the European response group against only 11 % in the U.S. group). Against this background, it is probably not unreasonable to maintain that, so far, peace education is predominantly a European phenomenon.

With the knowledge I have obtained through the literature inventory (as shown in Bjerstedt & Gustafsson, 1986, among others), I am astonished to see that so many U.S. "Departments of Education" have answered No to Question 2, considering the great number of publications on peace education which have, in fact, appeared in recent years. A possible explanation is that these publications are produced mostly by special peace-oriented interest groups who have difficulty in getting accepted or even noticed on the commercial textbook market in the U.S. This also means that they have less chance of being noticed or accepted by the school-administration establishment. It is possible that the production and use of these teaching materials can also be limited to certain states.

6) It is possible to distinguish a number of different perspectives and methods of procedure on the peace education field, which lead to different emphases in articles, textbooks and handbooks. Some of these approaches will be briefly mentioned here.

One of these we could call the "International Understanding Perspective" or, with a somewhat different accent, the "Perspective of the Responsible World Citizen". This has a close connection to programs within UNESCO, such as the so-called ASPRO Project (a program for the exchange of experiences between schools of different countries; compare, for example, Churchill & Omari, 1981). In this perspective, mutual dependency is emphasized, as well as the importance of neutralizing ethnocentricity, prejudice and

discrimination through mutual contact and a global outlook. Even if there is much left to accomplish, one can say that this is the approach that has been most widely integrated in the school programs of different countries (compare further, for example, Gault, 1985; Wesołowska, 1986).

Another perspective is more closely connected to peace movements in various countries and has worked lately primarily with disarmament and the risks of nuclear proliferation in particular. Perhaps we can call this approach the "Disarmament Education Perspective", and we often find an emphasis on communication training and training to find peaceful strategies for solving conflicts (compare, for example, Becker, 1985; Haavelsrud, 1981; Zola & Zola, 1985). An interesting but by no means uncomplicated task is to come up with methods for promoting the transfer of skills and ambitions from the personal micro-level to the international macro-level (Pikas, 1985).

One additional perspective within this field could be called the "Education for Justice Approach". This perspective emphasizes (sometimes from a political, sometimes from a religious perspective) various forms of injustice, non-equality and "structural violence" as factors which ought to be consciously illuminated and eradicated before a stable and worth-while peace is possible (see for example, Curle, Freire & Galtung, 1976; McGinnis, 1984; also several contributions in Dikawar & Agrawal, 1984). A slightly related, but more specific direction is represented by the "Feminist Perspective" (as elaborated by Brock-Utne, 1985).

Additional perspectives and aims may be distinguished, but I believe the above-mentioned to be the most prominent. For the continued development of peace education, it is, in my view, important to combine the most fruitful central characteristic of these various perspectives into an integrated educational effort. This question should be kept in mind when

attempting to formulate concrete objectives in the educational peace work (cf. Bjerstedt, 1985, 1986c).

7) There seems to be a fairly widespread opinion reflected in the materials collected that "peace education" is not primarily the task of a particular course or special subject, but rather an "interdisciplinary perspective" which should permeate many school subjects. While some older texts can be rather vague in their recommendations on this point, several of the newer analyses and handbooks are more detailed in their descriptions of how different school subjects can make a contribution (cf. Reich & Weber, 1984; Roberts & Carson, 1985; Röhrs, 1983).

8) The most common types of text on peace education contains many viewpoints on conceptual and terminological questions, as well as a large number of concrete suggestions for educational methods of tackling the subject. On the other hand, we discover comparatively few references to supporting empirical research. In fact, the lack of research-based knowledge must be said to be very evident. Considering the general importance of this field, I think it is remarkable how small the research resources have been to date. As I see it, there is strong reason to underline the need for psychological and educational research in the near future, directed towards a wide spectrum of aspects, from studies of students' conceptions of war and peace, of potential enemies, of how we can work for peace, etc. (cf., for example, Spielman, 1984; Wahlström, 1986), through systematic attempts to generate educational ideas in a dialog with experts and practitioners as well as critical analyses of existing practice and available teaching material (cf., for example, Kuhlmann, 1985), all the way to various kinds of innovative school experiments in close cooperation between researchers and teachers. We need an increased consciousness among those interested that simple

"feeding" of material on war and peace in school courses in no way guarantees that the desired goal will be reached. This is a difficult area for education, and critical analyses and follow-up studies are necessary.

9) Many of the more or less official documents published recently in different countries and states are useful reading for those of us interested in the further development of this field. I therefore present an exemplifying list (see Box 5). It is worth noting that all of the listed documents have been published in recent years: 1982-1986.

Before I leave this section of general viewpoints on the character of the response material, I would like to make a short comment on the trustworthiness of responses of this sort. It is evident that individual responses can have their shortcomings, especially simple reactions of the Yes/No type. Even if those replying have a position within their country or state school system, which could give a certain possibility for an overview, it cannot be taken for granted that they have in-depth knowledge of all affairs. Nor is it possible always to presume total honesty. If one must interpret simplified individual reactions with discretion and preferably look for "verifying confirmation" in other relevant information for the same area, one should nevertheless be able to draw certain conclusions as to the general lines in the result pattern, and that is just what we have been interested in here.

Best of all is when the short responses are accompanied by explanatory text and/or supporting documents. In the following part of the report I will try to give a more concrete picture of some of the conditions existing in the field of peace education in various countries, using such supplementary documentation.

Box 5.

Recent policy documents and reports related to peace education in school from various countries, states or local authorities: An exemplifying list

Alberta, Canada:

The nuclear threat: An issue for the classroom? Edmonton, Alberta: The ATA Magazine (Alberta Teachers' Association), 1984.

Australian Capital Territory:

Fidock, A. Peace education - or education for peace. Woden, ACT: Curriculum Development Centre, 1985.

Avon LEA, England:

Crump, G.F. (Ed.) Peace education: Guidelines for primary and secondary schools. Bristol: Education Department, 1983.

Bayern:

Was ist Frieden? Handreichung zur Behandlung des Themas „Frieden" im Unterricht, I-II. München: Staatsinstitut für Schulpädagogik und Bildungsforschung, 1983-84.

Berlin:

Seiring, W. Friedenserziehung in der Berliner Schule. Berlin: Landespressedienst, 1982.

California:

Nuclear age education. Assembly Bill Number 3848. State of California, 1984.

Nuclear age education: A report to the legislature. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, 1986.

Czechoslovakia:

Training of teachers for education concerning international cooperation, understanding, peace and disarmament. /Workshop report./ Prague: Ministry of Education of the Czech Socialist Republic, 1985.

Denmark:

Lassen, P. Fredsundervisning. København: Undervisningsministeriets tidsskrift Uddannelse, 1983.

DDR:

Education for peace, international understanding and respect for human rights through teaching of ethical and humanistic values in the German Democratic Republic. Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1985.

Box 5. (Continued)

Hamburg:

Grundsätze zur Friedenserziehung für Hamburger Schulen. Hamburg: Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung, 1983.

Hessen:

Friedenserziehung in der Schule - Überlegungen und Hinweise zur Information und Diskussion. Wiesbaden: Sonderdruck des Hessischen Kultusministers, 1983.

Indiana:

Becker, J.M. Teaching about nuclear disarmament. Bloomington, Indiana: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1985.

Iowa:

Nuclear arms education in secondary schools. Muscatine, Iowa: The Stanley Foundation, 1985.

Israel:

Hareven, A. A comprehensive educational programme on Arab-Jewish and Arab-Israeli relations. Jerusalem: The van Leer Jerusalem Institute, 1985.

The Netherlands:

Gerritsma, H.B. (Ed.) Vredesonderwijs: Opvattingen en ervaringen. Utrecht: Vredesopbouw, 1985.

Newcastle upon Tyne LEA, England:

Education Committee, Newcastle upon Tyne. Nuclear issues in education: A teaching guide. Newcastle upon Tyne: Pendower Hall Teachers' Centre, n.d.

New Zealand:

Guidelines for peace studies. Wellington, New Zealand: Department of Education, 1986.

Niedersachsen:

Schule und Friedenserziehung. Hannover: Niedersächsischer Kultusminister, 1983.

Nordrhein-Westfalen:

Friedenserziehung in der Schule. Düsseldorf: Der Kultusminister des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, 1985.

Box 5. (Continued)

Norway:

"Peace and security": 2-period optional subject in the upper secondary school. Oslo: Ministry of Church and Education, 1984.

Fredsarbeid i grunnskolen. (Grunnskolerådets informasjonshefte, Nr 32.) Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1986.

Nottinghamshire LEA, England:

Report to the Education Committee of the Working Party on the Development of a Curriculum for Peace Education. Nottingham: Education Department, 1983.

Some curriculum implications for peace education. Nottingham: Education Department, 1983.

Peru:

McGregor, F. Educación para la paz. Lima, Peru: ANES, 1985.

Poland:

Wesołowska, E.A. Education for peace in the Polish educational system. Warsaw: Ministry of Education & Polish Interpress Agency, 1986.

Sheffield LEA, England:

Education for peace resources. Sheffield: Westbourne Teachers' Centre, 1984.

Sweden:

Thelin, B. Peace education: Peace - liberty - development - human rights. Stockholm: Swedish National Board of Education, 1985.

Switzerland:

Seminaire "Education à la paix": Rapport final. Berne: Commission Nationale Suisse pour l'Unesco, 1986.

Victoria, Australia:

Peace education. /Report compiled by the Peace Education Task Force./ Melbourne: Victorian Education Department, 1985.

PEACE-ORIENTED ACTIVITIES IN THE SCHOOL: ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES FROM DIFFERENT COUNTRIES

In order to give the reader a somewhat more concrete picture of the state of peace education in different countries, I shall give a series of illustrative responses from letters and documents received. I shall arrange the notes according to geographical area, taking up groups of countries or states like the Nordic countries, the West German states etc. For each such group I shall try to give some general comments on the responses from that group, and then I shall present somewhat more detailed information on one country or a few countries within the group. Exhaustive descriptions have not been aimed at; rather the idea has been to give some characteristic glimpses of the information available. It should be added, perhaps, that when I present notes on the situation in different countries, I not only make use of material from the official responses; I also supplement information here and there drawn from my inventory of literature and personal contacts.

When I quote or refer to letters, I shall occasionally use a personal catalogue number. For the reader, these numbers do not have much meaning, but for my own control possibilities they have been worth-while. The figures and percentages quoted above refer to the first 121 "independent" responses to arrive, representing separate geographical entities. However, it has not been unusual that I have followed up a first reply with supplementary contacts with individuals or institutes referred to in the original reply. In addition, answers have continued to drop in slowly also after the main analysis was made. So far the number of catalogued responses is 190. A low number indicates that the letter arrived early, whereas a high number indicates that it arrived late.

The Nordic Countries

All of the Nordic countries - Denmark, Finland, Iceland, Norway, and Sweden - have presented official responses to the questionnaire. It can be stated simply that, while the interest in the peace education area exists in all of the countries at the grass-roots level, along with ensuing debate, it is primarily Finland, Norway and Sweden who have worked with these questions at the central administrative level, with subsequent directives and recommendations. As it is a question of our neighboring countries, I do not want to confine myself here to presenting responses from only one exemplifying country, but rather to give some items from each and every of the five countries.

Denmark

In Denmark there is an active association called "Lærere for fred" /"Teachers for Peace"/, and a great deal of articles and publications with connections to peace education in the school have been produced. A significant book by Jørgen P. Jensen and Søren Keldorff in this area is "Fredsundervisning - psykologi og pædagogik til fredsarbejdet" /"Peace Education - Psychology and Pedagogy in Peace Work"/ (1984). By way of introduction the authors say that the peace issue has now become "ready for school" in Denmark.

There are no central directives specifically for Peace Education, however. The school authorities emphasize that the ten-year Danish Folk School system is decentralized; it is the communal authorities who determine course plans. In an interview the Danish "Teachers for Peace" spokesman, Johnny Baltzersen, states, among other things:

"Several years ago, the 'Teachers for Peace' appealed to the Ministry of Education and recommended that the Ministry should send out a proclamation to all the schools in the country that they should start with peace education and use U.N. Week for the purpose. But that idea was rejected by the government, ... the reason being that because of the organisation of the school system, this should be determined at the local level, that it is up to the local school authorities. But the

latter have no money for this, and it is far more difficult to put across the necessity of peace education to 3,000 localities than it is to establish some central guidelines and ideas through public debate. It is difficult to get peace education accepted. Therefore we must employ all of our energy to legalizing peace education." (This interview was conducted for our project at the Malmö School of Education by Gunnel Ankarstrand-Lindström; cf. Baltzersen, Pøhler and Projektet Fredsberedskap, 1987.)

In spite of the lack of central guidelines, there is a certain amount of discussion material from centrally placed individuals available. One example is an article on peace education in the Ministry of Education's publication "Uddannelse" (1983) by Poul Lassen, at the Governing Body of the Folk School. Lassen takes up the discussion that has revolved around the question as to whether peace education aims in the first place at knowledge or personal involvement. His reasoning can be worth citing:

"Some teachers maintain that their function is to give knowledge, others that it is to shape attitudes and values. The United Nations and UNESCO also sway between these two aims in their recommendations.

Generally it can be said that education that does not engage the pupil cannot create international understanding and thereby the basis for a peaceful world, but also that an attitude grounded on one-sided information can only create temporary attitudes.

In peace education we are in a situation where complicated knowledge is to be brought to pupils in an appealing and well qualified manner which gives them a good background for making their own evaluations and choices in attitudes and actions.

This is a great mission." (Lassen, 1983, p. 9.)

Various peace organizations in Denmark have recently been quite active in bringing about international cooperation in the fields of peace education and peace promotion. One important manifestation of these efforts was the international congress "Together for the Future - Educate for Life", held in Copenhagen in August, 1986, with 195 delegates from 22 countries in East and West, including especially representatives of Teachers for Peace groups. (The second international Teachers for Peace congress was held in Bonn, the Federal Republic of Germany, 1988.)

Finland

According to current basic school law in Finland, the school has as its goal the training of pupils to be people with a "will for peace", and to develop those skills which help to further "international cooperation and peace" (Finland's Code of Statutes, No. 476, 2 §, 1983).

A further development of the concepts referred to in the law can be found in a publication of the Finnish National Board of Education ("Grunderna för grundskolans läroplan", 1985), where it is stated, for example: "Training for internationalism is the core of the ethical training of the school." An extended quotation may perhaps be of interest:

"International cooperation and peace

According to the recommendations of Unesco, training towards internationalism is a totality, which consists of training for international understanding, cooperation and peace. The concepts of human rights and fundamental freedoms is defined in accordance with the U.N. document on Human Rights.

The training towards internationalism involves educating the students to be citizens who actively support a common global responsibility. The training for internationalism is the core of the ethical training of the school.

The training towards internationalism should encourage knowledge and for the student activate personal models for thought and action which promote:

- respect for human rights and values and fundamental freedoms
- the realization of equality and justice
- respect for life and the will to protect life
- respect for human works, cultural gains and differences
- the feeling of mutual interdependence
- the will and ability to cooperate
- the striving for peaceful solutions to conflicts between individuals as well as between peoples and nations
- a lasting and socially just peace and the necessary conditions for peace
- the ability to objectively and critically judge one's own way of living and societal development in general, based on global goals
- the ability to take part personally also in practical work for mankind's positive future development."

There has been a considerable amount of literature published in Finland dealing with peace education. Our official response from Finland (letter 65) mentions, in that context, that material has been produced by a number of authorities and citizens' organizations (the Foreign Ministry, Finland's UNESCO commission, the Institute for Peace Research in Tampere /TAPRI/, Finland's U.N. Association, Unicef, Finland's Red Cross, the Institute for Peace Education etc.) and that it has been distributed to the schools through the National Board of Education, approved for home reading or as classroom material. The closing document from the Conference for Safety and Cooperation in Europe has been distributed to all schools. As an example of the material that the schools and teachers have at their disposal, the Finnish reply mentions a manual on peace education, produced by the Institute for Peace Research in Tampere as well as the material "Wake Up: A Peace Reader", which the Institute for Peace Education has prepared for instruction in English.

A great deal of discussion on peace education has been raised. Of course, it is difficult to objectively compare different countries in this context, but the impression is that the discussion in Finland has been comparatively matter-of-fact and positive towards the goals for peace-education, whereas the corresponding debate in Norway, for example, has sometimes been rather spiteful, and has contained quite a bit of suspicion as to the motives and political reliability of the peace workers.

In Finland, there is a good deal of psychological and educational research with connection to peace (see an extensive bibliography published by Helenius, Ollila & Pitkänen, 1983). When the Nordic educational researchers had a conference in Tampere in 1981, peace education was the main topic. One of the lecturers was Matti Koskenniemi, who emphasized that the social inner life of the school gives good possibilities for training

attitudes and behavior relevant to peace. In a letter to me (letter 44), Koskenniemi writes that he thinks this aspect has been observed all too little and that some of those who work with peace education have been "enthusiasts without educational insight or experience". (Matti Koskenniemi can be characterized as "the grand old man" in Finnish educational research. He published his doctor's thesis on social relations in the classroom more than 50 years ago.)

Iceland

The possible contributions of the school regarding peace education have been discussed in the newspapers and in the parliament. The discussion has tended to have a political profile with disagreement as to the character of peace education. As a consequence, no measures have been taken by the central school authorities in Iceland. There are neither official recommendations nor any instructional aids worth mentioning in this area. (Letter 91.)

Norway

There is a great deal of interest in Norway for peace questions, peace research and peace education. A symbol for this has been the Peace Research Institute in Oslo with its earlier leader, Johan Galtung. Among the educational researchers are well-known peace activists, such as Birgit Brock-Utne and Eva Nordland. They have also written a lot on peace questions. Found here, for example, is Birgit Brock-Utne's book, published in 1985, "Education for Peace", which looks at peace education from a feminist perspective.

The debate around peace-oriented activities in the school has, however, tended to be politically loaded, with a left-wing group having a positive attitude and a right-wing group having a more negative view of peace education. This has also meant that there has been certain

trend-breaking in the work on peace education as governments have shifted political color. Norwegian journalists have with some just cause created headlines such as "War about Peace Education".

Generally speaking, Norway is far ahead in working with peace education, in spite of what has been said about the discord and the breaking of trends. In reference to UNESCO's recommendations from 1974, the theme of peace education should be considered as part of "the school's general work on education for international understanding, cooperation and peace" (letter 100). Themes such as peace, security, human rights and disarmament should be considered in this context and integrated into existing school subjects such as social studies, history, and Norwegian.

Interestingly, however, the Ministry of Education has, in addition, approved a special plan, in 1984, on elective course-study which is peace-oriented ("Fred og sikkerhet" /"Peace and Security"/ in the upper secondary school), which also is described in an English text ("Peace and Security: 2-period optional subject in the upper secondary school", 1984).

The plan contains a series of descriptions of the goals of the work and the range of its content. The students ought to obtain knowledge and insight as to the causes of conflict and war on both the local and international levels. They should also receive information about peace work, conflict resolution, disarmament and the work for a new economic world system. It is underlined in the plan that it is important to find ways of working together that in themselves may contribute to the development of desirable attitudes and that the students are trained to solve conflicts in their own local environment.

The coming into being of this elective course was preceeded by struggle, and the present version is seen as a compromise, where viewpoints of the Defence Department played a role. In the course plan, this now

means that there is more about "the role of the defence system in the work for peace and security" than had originally been planned by the course founders, including directions like "There should be class sets of NATO handbooks". At the same time, it is emphasized that the course plan is a general frame-work. Teacher and students should work together to try to find the right educational combinations which can shed light on the central themes of the course. In the official response (letter 100), it is stated: "It is our impression that one no longer questions this optional subject and that this subject has been well received among teachers and students in the upper secondary school".

A large number of teaching aids have been published in recent years, for both teachers and students. A special issue of "Forsøksnytt" /"News on Educational Experimentation"/ (1982, no. 4-5) was devoted to peace education; a book for teachers entitled "Skole for fred" /"School for Peace"/ was edited by Harald Hansejordet (1982); and an official guide for teachers ("Fredsarbeid i grunnskolen" /"Peace Work in the Basic School"/ has been published in a series of information booklets for the school (1986).

Further information on peace education in Norway can be gathered, for example, from a special issue of a Norwegian educational journal ("Oppdragelse til fred" /"Rearing for Peace"/, 1982) and in an article by Magne Askeland (1984).

Sweden

Internationally, Sweden has a good reputation in peace circles; people such as Dag Hammarskjöld, Alva Myrdal and Olof Palme have contributed to this, as well as the establishment of the International Peace Research Institute in Stockholm (SIPRI). There is also a peace-oriented movement of respectable age in Sweden (The Swedish Peace and Arbitration Union has been in existence since 1883). Against this background, it is a bit

astonishing that university-based research and development dealing with peace questions and peace education has not had greater range of resources than has been the case.

As early as in the 1920's, however, we can come across the terms "peace training", "peace education" and "peace science" in publications that the Swedish schools' peace union released (EOS, 1927). Sweden was one of the countries initiating the international Associated Schools Project of Unesco (the ASPRO project) which started in the 1950's, testing different ways of developing education for international understanding through the exchange of information between schools in different countries (cf., for example, Bjerstedt & Rodhe, 1969). Sweden has also been an active participant in international contact services such as the Children's International Summer Villages (cf., for example, Bjerstedt, 1958).

In recent years, a series of initiatives within the peace education field has been taken by the central authority for the Swedish school system, The Swedish National Board of Education (NBE). An important role in this work has been played by Bengt Thelin, educational adviser to the NBE. Some examples of the NBE's contributions may be briefly mentioned: (1) A national conference for teachers and school leaders in 1984 served as a continuing education and as a spring-board for further activity, and materials from this conference have later been documented in a book on teaching methods ("Fredsundervisning i skolan" /"Peace Education in the School"/, 1985). (2) Seminars for researchers and teachers have been arranged, seeking to elucidate central concepts within the area of peace education; and a couple of research and development projects have been started ("International Understanding and Education for Peace", "Young People and Peace"). (3) The NBE has published an official booklet with recommendations on peace education, a so-called "service material"

(a Swedish version in 1985, an English version in 1986; see Thelin, 1986); and the Board has also cooperated in the publication of other texts within the field (for example, Pikas, 1983; Bjerstedt, 1985). - In these and other ways, the established school administration in Sweden has put itself on the side of the "peace workers", which has led to some criticism from friends of traditional law and order (compare comments in Thelin & the Project Preparedness for Peace, 1986).

It seems reasonable to say that the general prescriptive school texts in Sweden (centrally issued curricula for the compulsory school and the upper secondary school, known in Sweden as "Lgr 80" and "Lgy 70") supplemented by the NBE's more explicit recommendations in the "service material" referred to above, legitimize the work of the school with peace questions; something that Johnny Baltzersen, the spokesman for the Danish "Teachers for Peace" quoted above, found lacking in his country. By this, a ground work has been laid for continued development. Educational research departments and various organizations ought now to play a role in the shaping and testing of methods and materials for teaching in this field. Educational research work related to peace education is found especially in Malmö /Åke Bjerstedt/, Stockholm /Stig Lindholm/, and Uppsala /Anatol Pikas/ (cf. Bjerstedt, 1986a, 1987). Certain resources for organizations in this field have been made available through the so-called Peace Lottery. An example worth mentioning here is the cooperation between the Myrdal Foundation, the Swedish Red Cross and the Swedish U.N. Association for work on instructional materials useful in peace education.

The British Isles

Official replies have come in from England, Ireland, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales. It was emphasized in the response from England that the responsibility for questions of the sort that we are interested in here must be deferred to the local authorities: "the local education authorities" or "LEA's". The questionnaire was therefore sent to ten of these, and all of them have replied: Avon, Birmingham, Inner London, Leeds, Leicestershire, Liverpool, Manchester, Newcastle upon Tyne, Nottinghamshire and Sheffield. This gives a total of 14 "independent" responses plus one "dependent" (the reply from England proper).[1] The latter contains, among other things, a declaration of policy on behalf of the Conservative government, in the form of a speech given by Sir Keith Joseph in 1984.

It can perhaps be of interest to select a few quotations here from this speech. The central theme is that peace questions should not be dealt with separately, that one should avoid appealing to emotions and should not promote any particular view. Above all, one gets the impression that Sir Keith thinks very little of every form of peace education which could captivate the students' feelings against nuclear build-up. He has, however, strived to portray himself as somewhat neutral, so that he dissociates himself also from expressing commitment in an opposite direction (in other words, for the government policy that his own political party represents).

> "I must say first that I regret the label 'Peace Studies'. ... I deplore attempts to exploit the emotional connotation of the word 'peace'...
>
> There will be occasions - in history, in religious studies, in physics, in English, for example - when questions of the morality of war, the conditions which lie behind war and other aspects of international affairs

---

1) According to our procedures described above, the "dependent" reply is not included in the tables. Nor was the Liverpool answer included, since it arrived too late (cf. Appendix 1).

will crop up. As pupils mature they ought to be encouraged to apply their reasoning powers to these and other important issues of the day. ... Since such subjects will come up naturally in the curriculum there seems to be no need to make special space for studies labelled 'peace'. And when the subject does arise it seems to me essential that the teacher should deal with it in a proper professional way...

His presentation needs to be as objective as he can make it, in the sense that he ensures that what is offered as a fact is indeed true; that the selection of facts gives a picture which is neither unbalanced nor superficial; that facts and opinions are clearly separated; and that the pupils are encouraged to weigh evidence and arguments so as to arrive at rational judgements. ...

If asked by his pupils for his own views he should, as appropriate, declare where he himself stands but explain at the same time that others, in particular the pupils' parents and other teachers, may disagree with him. He should explain that such disagreements are legitimate given the complexity and valueladen nature of the issues and that the pupils too need to weigh the evidence and considerations for themselves and try to reach their own opinions, respecting as they do so the possibly contrary opinions of others.

... If a LEA gives guidance on this matter to schools, the guidance should aim to support ... professionalism ... Unfortunately, in the course of preparing such guidance, opinions are expressed and propagated by councillors and others which do great educational harm. I deplore such attempts to trivialise the substance of the issue of peace and war, to cloud it with inappropriate appeals to emotion... I deplore attempts to preach one-sided disarmament to primary pupils ... or to offer to older pupils only one of the many views about national defence... The job of the teacher is to introduce children and young people to serious matters in a serious and responsible way. He should not be asked ... to promote a certain view on the issue of peace and war, whether this takes the form of inviting consent to the present Government's defence policy as a patriotic duty, or to the programme of the CND." (CND = Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament).

Towards the end of the speech, Sir Keith mentions the possibilities for displeased parents to complain about indoctrination in the schools to the Department of Education and Science.

The speech is to be seen against a background of the periodically vehement discussion which has taken place in Great Britain between advocates and opponents of peace education, and which has flared up in conjunction with individual LEA's appointing committees to develop

guidelines for peace-oriented activities in the schools.

A preliminary map of "Peace Education in Britain" is shown in Box 6, taken from a small news bulletin entitled "Avon Peace Journal" (1984/85, pp. 10-11). The figures point out different individuals, groups or institutions which, one way or another, have worked with questions concerning peace education. It is evident that these activities are spread out over most parts of Great Britain. In the above-mentioned issue of the "Avon Peace Journal", there are brief descriptions of the different activities, which are indicated by numbers on the map. It would carry us too far into details to give all of these here, but some abbreviated examples can be presented, with reference to a selection of numbers:

2 = Avon Education Authority (Bristol). Has produced a set of peace education guidelines for use in primary and secondary schools. (See also text below for further details.)

4 = Avon Peace Education project (Bristol). A three-year project on peace education. Has carried out a survey of attitudes among 11-15 year olds towards the threat of nuclear war, published a small journal (Avon Peace Education Journal) and a series of pamphlets on peace education in different school subjects.

8 = Peace Education Project (PEP), Peace Pledge Union (London). A long-term project which researches, designs, produces and distributes a wide variety of materials for use in schools and colleges on peace and war. A newsletter (PEP Talk) is also distributed.

9 = Teachers for Peace (London). An educational contact network with newsletter and teaching materials. Affiliated to CND (Campaign for Nuclear Disarmament).

11 = Pax Christi (London). Pax Christi is an international Catholic peace movement. The London group does not confine its work to religious groups, however. Organizes conferences for teachers, produces educational materials (for example, "Peacenotes" - a magazine for young people).

15 = Peace Education Network (PEN; Kenton, Middlesex). A contact organization for persons working to implement education for peace in the classroom.

23 = Housman's Bookshop (London): Bookshop with a good stock of materials on peace and peace education.

41 = World Studies Teacher Training Center (University of York, Heslington, York). Offers pre-service and

in-service teacher training in World Studies and related fields. Issues reports and "World Studies Journal". Director: David Selby.

42 = Centre for Peace Studies (St. Martins College, Lancaster). Functions as an advice and enquiry service for teachers, schools and LEAs. Project on World Studies curriculum. Publishes a series of CPS Occasional Papers. Contact: Dr. David W. Hicks.

44 = Richardson Institute for Conflict and Peace Research (University of Lancaster, Lancaster). Offers courses, carries out research, issues publications.

47 = Joint Peace Education Programme of the Irish Council of Churches and the Irish Commission for Justice and Peace (Belfast). Provides materials for peace education and teacher education.

Besides the expression "peace education", which is our umbrella term in this overview, two other terms are often used in British discussions, with related but not synonymous meanings: "peace studies" (see, for example, Duczek, n.d.) and "world studies" (see, for example, Fisher & Hicks, 1985).

Among the official responses received, I choose to exemplify the material from one of the local districts: Avon.

Avon

Avon is a district in the southwest of England, with Bristol as the central city. On the map, it is represented by points 2 and 4, with point 2 indicating the official school authorities who responded to our questionnaire.

Avon is an example of a school district that compiled a specific district brochure with recommendations for the treatment of peace questions in the schools. A committee was appointed for the purpose; a document was produced and officially approved. The document, an A-4 booklet of about 80 pages called "Peace Education: Guidelines for Primary and Secondary Schools" (1983), was distributed to all of the schools, and meetings were held with teachers to discuss the proposals. As is the English custom, the decision was left to the individual schools as to how the proposals should be carried out.

Box 6.

The distribution of individuals, groups and institutions with peace-oriented educational aims in Great Britain (according to "Avon Peace Education Journal", 1984/85). A number of the figures are clarified in the text.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

It can be of interest briefly to describe the contents of this booklet with guidelines. A preface underlines that the teacher, in his/her duty in preparing the students for the future in a complex world, has often to deal with difficult and controversial subjects. Even if it might be tempting to avoid them, the school would, in doing so, elude a very important responsibility. The guidelines have been compiled with the aim of helping the teachers meet that responsibility.

The main body of the material is divided into three parts, marked by white, yellow and green pages.

The first part is an introduction and discussion section, where, among other things, the meaning of the concept "peace education" is dealt with. Three mutually related aims are stated here:

"(i) To help pupils understand some of the complex processes leading to tension and conflict at individual, group, national and global levels, and be aware of some of the ways in which these conflicts may be resolved.

(ii) To encourage attitudes that lead to a preference for constructive and non-violent resolution of conflict.

(iii) To help pupils develop the personal and social skills necessary to live in harmony with others and to behave in positive and caring ways." (P. 1.)

In one of the introductory sections, various apprehensions are taken up that are often expressed by people who feel hesitant towards peace-related education. In this connection, there is a discussion of the difficulties that lie ahead. Next, peace education is discussed as part of both the formal and hidden curriculum. It holds true not only that education in the school's various subjects must deal with relevant aspects of war and peace in a way that promotes the stated goals; it holds also true that the school must encourage the personal development of the pupils so that they may be prepared to cope with conflict in a constructive way; finally, it holds also true that the total world of the school must be shaped so that it functions as a support rather than a hindrance on the road towards these goals. This

argument is concluded with a checklist designed to help the teacher to estimate to what degree the school (or class) is promoting the objectives of peace education (see Box 7).

The second section of the booklet, which is the most comprehensive, is composed of eighteen "case studies" or examples of how peace education, as described in general, can be promoted in concrete ways in various situations. Most of the examples are descriptions of approaches which have already been tested in various schools in the Avon district.

The third section gives a relatively detailed (about 30 pages) overview covering different aids in working with these questions: books, films, journals and organizations.

In the official letter from the school authority in Avon (letter 37), it is reported that the work with the booklet was followed up by a number of voluntary study-days for teachers. There have been critics who have expressed misgivings or apprehensions about indoctrination, but, as is pointed out, a newly conducted study by Her Majesty's Inspectorate shows that no such indoctrination could be detected.

Other groups within the Avon district have compiled material for peace-oriented activities in the schools, alongside this official material. For example, a project group has been at work (Avon Peace Education Project; number 4 in the summary above in Box 6), which has put together booklets for education within special subject areas (for example, "Educating for Peace through Geography", 1984; "Educating for Peace through Social Education", 1984). Furthermore, the group has published a dozen issues of a news bulletin, "Avon Peace Education Journal".

In conclusion, it can be mentioned that a source of supplementary information concerning the situation of peace-oriented education in Great Britain is a short report by the Richardson Institute for Conflict and

Box 7.

An example of a checklist designed as introductory help in estimating to which degree a school is promoting the objectives of peace education (from "Peace Education", compiled on commission by the Avon Education Department, 1983, p. 11).

A Checklist for Promoting the Objectives of Peace Education in Schools

Schools, departments or individual teachers may consider existing attitudes and practice relating to Peace Education. The checklist has been found a useful way of beginning this analysis. From this position of awareness and clarification of objectives future work can be planned.

	For your School/Department/Class Tick the Appropriate Space		
A CHECKLIST PROMOTING THE OBJECTIVES OF PEACE EDUCATION IN PRIMARY AND SECONDARY SCHOOLS	Positive Work Being Done	Deserves Greater Emphasis	Disagree With Objective
ARE PUPILS GIVEN OPPORTUNITIES TO STUDY THE CAUSES, TYPES AND CONSEQUENCES OF VIOLENCE AND TO STUDY THE HISTORY AND PRACTICE OF NON-VIOLENCE?			
ARE PUPILS GIVEN THE OPPORTUNITY TO STUDY LOCAL, NATIONAL AND WORLD ISSUES WHICH THREATEN PEACE.			
ARE PUPILS ENCOURAGED TO BE AWARE OF THEIR RESPONSIBILITY FOR WORLD DISARMAMENT?			
ARE PUPILS BROUGHT TO AN AWARENESS OF HOW SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY CAN BE USED TO THE BENEFIT OR DETRIMENT OF SOCIETY?			
ARE PUPILS GIVEN SKILLS THAT WILL ENABLE THEM TO JUDGE ARGUMENTS, INFORMATION, THE MASS MEDIA, ETC, WITH DISCRIMINATION?			
ARE PUPILS ENCOURAGED TO SEE THE WORLD AS A PLACE WHERE, ULTIMATELY ALL HUMAN BEINGS SHARE A COMMON INTEREST AND WHERE PROBLEMS OF POVERTY, OPPRESSION, WAR, ENVIRONMENT, ETC, ARE EVERYBODY'S PROBLEMS?			
ARE PUPILS HELPED TO AN AWARENESS OF HOW THEIR OWN VIEWPOINTS AND PERCEPTIONS ARE AFFECTED AND LIMITED BY THE CULTURE, CLASS, SOCIETY, NATIONALITY, ETC, OF WHICH THEY ARE MEMBERS?			
ARE PUPILS HELPED TO DEVELOP A PERSONAL MORALITY BASED ON JUSTICE AND NON-VIOLENCE?			
ARE PUPILS HELPED TO EXPLORE THEIR OWN INDIVIDUALITY AND INDEPENDENCE WHILST, AT THE SAME TIME, DEVELOPING A SENSE OF RESPONSIBILITY TOWARDS OTHERS?			
ARE PUPILS TAUGHT THE SKILLS NECESSARY FOR PARTICIPATING IN A DEMOCRACY AND ENCOURAGED TO TAKE RESPONSIBILITY FOR THEIR OWN LIVES?			
ARE PUPILS GIVEN OPPORTUNITIES TO EXPLORE THEIR FEELINGS ABOUT THE FUTURE AND TO DEVELOP HOPEFUL PHILOSOPHIES			
ARE PUPILS GIVEN OPPORTUNITIES TO EXPERIENCE THE VALUE OF WORKING CO-OPERATIVELY TOGETHER?			
DOES THE SCHOOL/DEPARTMENT/CLASSROOM PROVIDE AN ENVIRONMENT WHICH ENHANCES AND ENCOURAGES FEELINGS OF SELF-WORTH?			

Peace Research (number 44 in the summary in Box 6). This report is titled "Peace Education in Great Britain" and was written by Hanns-Fred Rathenow and Paul Smoker. - Other valuable references are, for example: Fisher & Hicks, 1985; Hicks, 1986; Lessons before midnight, 1984; National Union of Teachers, 1984; Pilkington, 1985; Tubb, 1987; Yarwood & Weaver, 1986; Young, 1984.

The West German States

Official responses from West Germany have been received from the following states: Baden-Württemberg (letter 32), Bayern (letter 17), Berlin (letter 21), Bremen (letter 46), Hamburg (letter 1), Hessen (letter 10), Niedersachsen (letter 38), Nordrhein-Westfalen (letter 7), Rheinland-Pfalz (letter 4), Saarland (letter 10), and Schleswig-Holstein (letter 23). There are two additional letters from the West German area which are not counted in the tables: one from the cooperative organization, the Culture Ministers' Conference (Sekretariat der Ständigen Konferenz der Kultusminister der Länder in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland, letter 52), and one from the research center HSFK (Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung, letter 64).

Two superficial characteristics distinguish the responses from the West German states: together, they compose a very thick bundle with several extensive documents; and all of the states responded, and responded quickly, which is indicated by the low letter numbers (they responded, for example, before our neighbors Finland and Norway). The scope and speed of the West German replies may be partly attributed to general characteristics of the German administrative tradition, but it is not unreasonable to see these qualities as an indication that the area of peace education has been a current and urgent topic in the Federal Republic of Germany.

This is also apparent in the response distribution (see Box 8). I have made a simple summary where the response distribution for West Germany can be compared with both the other European replies and with those from the non-European nations to each of the three main questions (compare with the formulations in Box 2, above). The differences are perhaps most clear when one counts the percentage of Yes responses in relation to the sum of Yes and No answers. As to Question 3, the West German states do not hold any special position. However,

we do get a very marked result picture for the first two questions.

Concerning both the occurrence of official recommendations within this field (Question 1), as well as of teaching materials (Question 2), we get over 80 % Yes-replies from the West German states. In comparison, the non-European Yes responses are relatively few (24 % in Question 1 and 53 % in Question 2), while the other European nations cover the middle ground. Earlier in this report, I found reason to say that peace education could be seen as basically a European phenonomen. Now there is cause to add that peace education has become a question which has aroused an exceedingly high degree of attention in the West German states.

School questions are handled with a certain degree of autonomy in the separate states. At the same time, in the Culture Ministers' Conference (the organ of cooperation between the ministers of the different states), the states try to move forward towards cooperative solutions. A lively discussion was carried on in this forum between 1980 and 1983, on the possibilities of publishing coordinated instructions for peace education in the schools. One can read about the debate in the book "Weder Wehrkunde noch Friedenserziehung?" published by Dieter S. Lutz in 1984. Here are also documents from the various working groups, statements from individual culture ministers and positions taken by different organizations.

Two opposing views crystallized relatively quickly, as manifest in a conservative and a Social Democratic draft on principles. In the former, "Friedenssicherung und Bundeswehr" is emphasised and knowledge of defence is an important ingredient. Visits by so-called "Jugendoffiziere" in the schools are recommended. The latter camp on the other hand places emphasis on a peace education with the starting point in the United Nations' statutes. These rather different proposals set off an animated and occasionally hard debate, and no compromise

Box 8.

Comparisons between the West German responses, other European responses, and non-European responses: The Yes/No proportions on the questions of peace education's official status (Question 1), the presence of teaching materials (Question 2), and the presence of debate (Question 3). The category "other answer" has not been included

	Percentages		Raw Scores	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
Question 1				
West German states	88	12	7	1
Other European	59	41	13	9
Non-European	24	76	14	45
Question 2				
West German states	86	14	6	1
Other European	72	28	13	5
Non-European	53	47	31	27
Question 3				
West German states	75	25	6	2
Other European	77	23	17	5
Non-European	33	27	41	15

Note:

1. The formulation of the questions has been given above (see, for example, Box 2).
2. The percentages have been calculated on low numbers, so that only more marked discrepancies should be noted. However, in the case of the West German states, it is a question of a "completed investigation", since no additional replies will come in to change the percentages.

in the form of cooperative recommendations was reached.

Here are some notes from one of the states, Hessen, as a supplement to this general sketch on peace education in the West German states.

Hessen

In the reply from Hessen (letter 10), the three main questions were all answered Yes, as was the case with most of the West German replies. The written recommendations on peace education in the schools were appended and entitled "Friedenserziehung in der Schule" (1983).

The brochure opens with a foreword from the Culture Minister in Hessen, in which he states that one of the schools' most important tasks in educating the coming generation for peace, is the endeavor to spare young people from the experience of their parents and grandparents. It is said that such endeavors are not new, but that because of atomic weapons and the risk of total destruction, they have taken a new dimension. The anxiety of young people must be met by the school, by giving them the opportunity to objectively discuss current and urgent questions. In this connection, different ideas about what promotes peace must be openly presented, for example, by representatives from the defence establishment, by peace researchers and by representatives from organizations, including conscientious objectors. The young people should have contact with a broad spectrum of opinions so that they themselves will be in a position, as mature and democratic citizens, to participate in the shaping of future policies for peace. The teachers should not be restricted to play the role as neutral purveyors of knowledge, but should rather be allowed to elucidate their own positions and motives. However, they must not make their own point of view an educational goal for the students.

In conclusion, the Culture Minister of Hessen mentions that the Conference of Culture Ministers, in spite of many discussions, has not succeeded in forming a

cooperative policy concerning peace education. However, the representatives of Bremen, Hamburg, Hessen und Nordrhein-Westfalen have decided to jointly publish their own recommendations. The central part of the Hessen brochure deals with this mutual text. It is linked to the United Nations' statutes and to UNESCO's recommendations from 1974. It discusses the concept of peace (peace being not only a condition, but also a principle for rational dealing with conflict in all areas of life). It also discusses in some detail what peace education is driving at. A few quotations from this discussion may be illuminating:

"Dialogfähigkeit und Konfliktfähigkeit sind die wichtigsten Komponenten von Friedensfähigkeit. Zur Dialogfähigkeit gehört das Einander-Zuhören, das Argumentieren, das Verstehen, das Akzeptieren und Tolerieren underschiedlicher Auffassungen und Positionen; zur Konfliktfähigkeit gehört es, Konflikte, ihre Ursachen und beteiligten Interessen zu erkennen, eigene Interessen und Positionen zu lokalisieren, Konflikte auszuhalten, Möglichkeiten der Konfliktregelung vorzuschlagen...

Friedenserziehung setzt deswegen Unterrichtsmethoden voraus, bei denen Schülerinnen und Schüler als verantwortlich Handelnde, als Partner akzeptiert werden, Unterrichtsmethoden, die problemorientiert und handlungsorientiert sind." (S 7.)

As an example of the educational material compiled in Hessen, a comprehensive textbook titled "Gleichgewicht, Rüstungskontrolle, Abrüstung", was appended to the reply. This is a guide for a civics course, compiled by HIBS (Hessisches Institut für Bildungsplanung und Schulentwicklung in Wiesbaden).

The book comprises 325 A-4 pages and deals with considerations of peace and security politics via five main themes. A course description with a summary of various materials is given within each theme, followed by a number of texts drawn from various sources and illuminating different points of view. The work gives a very ambitious impression. The desired goal to secure a plurality of perspectives and positions seems quite fulfilled. One can perhaps be somewhat more hesitant as to whether the authors have succeeded in avoiding the

risk of overwhelming the students with a too manifold and complex presentation. However, clearly the teacher plays a decisive role in assisting in the choice and use of the course content.

It is evident from the collection of newspaper clippings, included in the answer from Hessen, that the area of peace education has not been uncontroversial. "Streit um Friedenserziehung" is a key phrase in several contributions.

A certain amount of research within the field is also in progress in Hessen. At HSFK, Hessische Stiftung Friedens- und Konfliktforschung, there are a couple of projects on peace education. One project is entitled, "Bausteine zur Friedenserziehung" and consists of a series of attempts to develop various educational models as building units, possible to utilize in various pedagogic contexts. Another project is called "Entwicklung Kooperativer Gesellschaftsspiele" and concerns itself with more special attempts towards practical peace education through the development of "cooperative" games, as opposed to the more common games of competitive character.

Other Countries of Europe

The remaining responses from Europe form a relatively heterogeneous group. In some countries the concept of peace education seems to have played an insignificant role so far. Perhaps it can be considered surprising that a country with France's political and military position is one of these, whereas it may be understandable that a country without military power, such as Liechtenstein, belongs to this group ("Young people need not reflect upon the sense or nonsense of the compulsory military service", letter 51).

I choose here to illustrate the situation concerning peace education in five other countries: first three Eastern European states (DDR, Poland, and the Soviet Union), then the Netherlands and Switzerland.

DDR (East Germany)

An official response from "Ministerium für Volksbildung" was received from DDR (letter 114); in addition, we have an information brochure from the DDR Culture Center in Stockholm (letter 90) as well as a personal letter from Professor Manfred Vorwerg in Leipzig (letter 104).

It is clear from all these responses that peace education is considered to constitute a fundamental part of the school's task (against a background of, among other things, experience from two world wars). The ministry, as well as Professor Vorwerg also answered Yes to all our questions. The ministry included in their reply seven booklets which deal with the area in question. I render five of the titles here, since the headings give an indication of their character:

a) Zum Beitrag der Lehrpläne und Schulbücher für Geschichte und Staatsbürgerkunde sowie für andere Fächer zur Erziehung der Schuljugend im Geiste des Friedens, der Abrüstung, der internationalen Verständigung und Achten der Menschenrechte in der DDR. Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1982.

b) Education for peace, security, détente and disarmament, for international understanding and cooperation and with respect to human rights and fundamental freedoms in the German Democratic Republic. Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1983.

c) Educational journals published in the German Democratic Republic devoted to peace education. Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1984.

d) Education for peace, international understanding and respect for human rights through teaching of ethical and humanistic values in the German Democratic Republic. Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1985.

e) No more war and Fascism! Education of the young generation in the spirit of peace and social progress. Potsdam: International Scientific Symposium, National Commission for UNESCO of the German Democratic Republic, 1985.

Two characteristics are manifest in these publications, as is already clear in the headings: the close connection to UNESCO's work with these questions (we clearly recognize the key-words in UNESCO's recommendations from 1974) and the emphasis on anti-fascism (symbolized by the conference title "No More War and Fascism!"). Let me describe briefly the contents in one of the two most recently published booklets.

The booklet, "Education for Peace..." (1985), consists of four parts and has been put together by a six-person group, led by Dr. Werner Köhler (coordinator of a UNESCO project). A general characterization of the educational system of the German Democratic Republic is given in the opening section, with special emphasis on education for peace. An enumeration of what is regarded as the "basic values" is made here (for example, peace and disarmament; international understanding and cooperation on an equal footing; the elimination of colonialism, racism, apartheid and fascism; human interrelations based on mutual help; and a guaranteed right to work, social security and justice). It is noted that the students are trained, in ethical and moral discussions, always to consider value concepts from a "what-serves-whom" angle.

In the booklet's second section, it is shown how education for peace can be included in the kindergarten

and the lower grades of school. For example, one celebrates an international children's day, sings peace songs (such as "Kleine weisse Friedenstaube") and learns about the circumstances in different countries. Practical solidarity activities outside the school (such as within the Ernst Thälman Pioneer Organization) play an important role.

The third section of the booklet exemplifies how education for peace can be dealt with in different subjects in the upper grades of the school, such as in history, geography, literature, art and music. The intrinsic values one wants to effect take the character of a "humanism of action", it is said. "Humanistic values cannot be seen as detached from social conditions... Humanism of action is the order of the day." (P. 27.)

In the booklet's fourth and last section, the authors discuss how peace-education aspects can be promoted in the training of teachers, among other things, by involving future teachers in international contacts.

Poland

Our questionnaire's three major questions are answered Yes also in the official Polish response (letter 60). A newly published booklet, "Education for Peace in the Polish Educational System" (1986), written by Eugenia Anna Wesołowska, was added as supplementary information. The contents will be briefly described here.

The introductory chapter underlines that education for peace becomes a natural idea against the background of Poland's tragic history during the 1800's and 1900's, the dramatic effects of the Second World War in Poland and the growing threat from nuclear weapons in recent decades. There is also a series of official state proclamations about the aims and tasks of peace education, including a document from the Ministry of Education, from 1978, with the heading "Education for Peace in the Polish Educational System".

In that document, 25 specific "tasks" are described, some of which can be quoted here from Wesołowska's summary:

"- the strengthening of the conviction that peace is the supreme good of mankind and a condition of the versatile development of societies; ...
- the showing of the danger posed by mass destruction weapons and the danger of devastation;
- the shaping of sensitivity to, and the readiness to counteract, injustice, violence, intolerance;
- the teaching of how to identify anti-humanistic doctrines and ideologies, such as racism, fascism, nationalism, chauvinism." (P. 7.)

In the second chapter, examples of the contents of Polish education connected to these aims are given. It is underlined that peace education is a task for all school subjects and all types of school activities. History teaching deals with, among other things, the experiences from the Second World War, the tragic memory of which is still alive in Polish families, the horrors of Hiroshima and Nagasaki, as well as the purposes and forms of activity of the United Nations. The reading of literature is used in discussions of moral and ideological questions.

Teachers' basic and continued education is touched upon in the booklet's third chapter, where, among other things, Radio and Television Teachers' University (NURT), with five weekly programs in pedagogical and methodical questions for teachers' continued education, plays a significant role.

All teachers in Poland have, besides their responsibility as organizers of studies in the classroom, the responsibility for some activities outside the school as well (such as acting as leaders for youth organizations, hobby circles, etc.). These extra-curricular activities are considered an essential part of the educational work, and contributes, according to the booklet, to make it possible "to shape pacifistic attitudes among young people in Poland" (p. 14). ZHP, the Polish Pathfinders' Union, has a long tradition and many members among children and young people (approximately 3,000,000 members). ZHP organizes

ecological activities and international exchange with other countries, along with traditional scouting activities.

A special educational role is played by the so-called "Memorial Chambers", that is, memorial exhibitions arranged by students and teachers (often concentrating on the collection of documents and pictures from local Second World War experiences). School classes also habitually visit the different official museums and exhibitions in Poland related to the country's war experiences, including the shocking environments that the Nazi concentration camps form.

A special chapter is devoted to UNESCO Associated Schools (earlier touched upon in this report). Poland can boast the largest number of such schools in the world, which among other things promote the exchange of letters and materials between schools in different countries.

Educational research and development work in the field of education for peace and international understanding has been pursued for a number of years, especially in conjunction with UNESCO work. In 1984, a report was published with the long yet informative title, "Research Report of the Institute for School Curricula of the Ministry of Education Undertaken in the Context of the UNESCO Joint Study of 'Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms through the Teaching of Ethical and Humanistic Values' 1983-1984". The author is again E.A. Wesołowska. The studies reported deal with textbooks (what types of information on different countries are given in the textbooks in history, geography and Polish?), as well as students' conceptions (what conceptions of different countries and about war and peace can be gleaned from reading student essays?).

The Soviet Union

From the Soviet Union, an official response from the Ministry of Education has been received (letter 109) as well as information from the Soviet Peace Committee (letter 63). I have also had the opportunity to discuss these questions with a Soviet peace researcher who was on a temporary visit to Malmö (Boris Manow, a lawyer connected with a research institute in Moscow).

In the official letter from the Ministry of Education, they have chosen to give a general description of the Soviet peace education, instead of directly answering the questionnaire. The letter is reproduced in its entirety in Box 9. Some resemblance between what is said here and what has been presented by DDR and Poland may be noted.

What is not said in the official letter, but which was pointed out by Boris Manow and also touched upon by the material from the Soviet Peace Committee, is that since 1983, every school year is initiated with a special "peace lesson". Even if a single lesson cannot convey so much knowledge, it is clear that the placement of such a lesson at the beginning of each new school year has a special symbolic value. In 1985, this introductory lesson was dedicated to the 40-year memory of the ending of the Second World War and to the foundation of the United Nations. On the same day, many cities and villages arranged large-scale peace marches and other anti-war manifestations.

Obviously, peace education plays an important role in all three East European nations dealt with here. It is legitimized to a high degree and decreed by the central authorities. In some western countries one can hear the view from time to time, that this is an official phrase-mongering without any real substance. The adjudgement of individual features in peace education can of course be difficult. We should, however, remember that the states mentioned were those that most severely experienced the horrors of the

Box 9.

The official reply from the Soviet Union to our international questionnaire on peace education

МИНИСТЕРСТВО ПРОСВЕЩЕНИЯ
СССР
"24" апреля 1986 года
179-1491/12

Профессору Эйку Бьёрстеду,
Школа образования, бокс 23501,
С-200 45, Мальме,
Швеция

Уважаемый господин Бьёрстед !

В ответ на Ваше письмо с просьбой рассказать о воспитании советских школьников в духе мира, сообщаем следующее:

Воспитание в духе мира начинается в нашей стране с раннего детства. Оно является основой учебно-воспитательной работы в детских садах, школах, профтехучилищах и внешкольных учреждениях. Вопросам мира, мирного сосуществования и сотрудничества уделяется большое внимание в школьных учебных программах. Эти вопросы широко освещаются в периодической молодёжной печати.

Воспитанию в духе мира способствуют различные формы работы с учащимися:

- уроки мира, уроки мужества;
- ярмарки солидарности с народами, борющимися за свободу и независимость;
- проведение "Дня юного антифашиста";
- регулярные политинформации;
- клубы интернациональной дружбы;
- музеи трудовой и боевой славы в школах;
- митинги солидарности с борцами за мир, сбор подписей под обращениями, и т.д.

Советские школьники активно участвуют и в трудовых "вахтах мира". Средства от сбора макулатуры и металлолома, от работы в летних трудовых лагерях перечисляются в Фонд Мира. Советские школы принимают участие в симпозиумах ЮНЕСКО по вопросам воспитания в духе мира.

Таким образом, можно говорить о сложившейся в СССР системе воспитания подрастающего поколения в духе мира. Как Вы знаете, вопрос сохранения мира - это основной вопрос внешнеполитического курса нашего правительства, о чем говорят советские мирные инициативы и конкретные шаги на пути предотвращения ядерной войны.

Искренне желаем Вам успехов в деле воспитания молодежи в духе мира.

Управление международных связей
Министерства просвещения СССР.

Box 9. (Continued)

Here is a translation of the letter from the Soviet Union (based on a translation into Swedish by the Department of Slavic Languages, Lund University):

Ministry of Education
April 24, 1986
179-1097/12

Professor Åke Bjerstedt
School of Education
Box 23501
S-200 45 Malmö, Sweden

Honorable Mr. Bjerstedt,

In reply to your letter, which contains a request of an account of Soviet school children's peace education, may we inform you of the following:

Peace education begins at an early age in our country. It is the foundation for education in the day care centers, schools, technical vocational schools and in the institutions outside of the school. Peace questions, peaceful coexistence and peaceful cooperation all receive great attention in the schools' educational programs. These questions receive broad illumination in the young people's periodical press. Peace education is promoted through different activities:

- peace lessons, lessons in courage;
- solidarity fairs for people struggling for peace and independence;
- the realization of "The Young Anti-Fascist's Day";
- regular political information;
- international friendship clubs;
- school museums which illustrate the honor of work and struggle;
- solidarity meetings for the fighters for peace;
- the collection of signatures of appeal, etc.

Soviet school children also take part actively as "peace guards." The income from paper and scrap-metal drives and from the work in summer camps is deposited into the "Peace Fund." Soviet schools take part in UNESCO symposia dedicated to peace education.

In this manner, one can speak of a system in the growing generation's peace education in the U.S.S.R. As you know, the question of maintaining peace is our government's most important foreign policy issue, which is evident in Soviet peace initiatives and concrete steps on the road for avoiding a nuclear war.

We sincerely wish you success in the peace education of your youth.

U.S.S.R.'s Ministry of Education
Board for International Relations

Second World War in their own countries. In the Soviet Union, in Poland and in the German states, nearly every person has had personal experience of war casualties among close friends or relatives. There is no reason to doubt that this gives a very real background to deeply felt anti-war attitudes among large groups of people in these countries.

The Netherlands

Four different replies were received from the Netherlands, because the Ministry of Education forwarded the questionnaire to four different institutions connected with peace education: (1) Polemologisch Instituut, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen (H.B. Gerritsma); (2) Centrum voor Internationale Vorming, CEVNO, in Alkmaar; (3) Netherlands Institute for International Relations (R. Aspeslagh); and (4) Stichting Vredesopbouw, Utrecht.

On Question 1, concerning the occurrence of official recommendations, three Yes-answers and one No-answer were received. The explanation of the slight disagreement is evident from the commentaries: There is no comprehensive recommendation for the entire country issued by the school system; it is not considered part of the school system's function. It is, however, common that cities and smaller communities draw up such recommendations for their areas.

On Question 2, involving educational materials, all replied Yes, and it was emphasized that there is a great deal of teaching aids and guides for the different levels of education. A center for peace questions in Nijmegen has the ambition to gather all such material in a special collection. In Utrecht, there is Stichting Vredesopbouw (the Foundation for the Building of Peace), which has developed and distributes various teaching aids and guides for peace education.

As in England and West Germany, there has been a

lively debate between advocates and opponents of peace education in the school. The arguments have been similar (the opponents have spoken about indoctrination and doomsday mentality), but violence in the debate is considered to have been less in the Netherlands.

A central concept in part of this discussion and work in the Netherlands has been "mondiale vorming", referring to an integrated global political education, focusing on disarmament, ecology and underdevelopment.

Generally speaking, one can say that the role of peace education in the school has been an important one in the Netherlands, and that the work with these tasks has gone far (for example, via long-term research and development efforts). This can be partly related to the fact that peace research had early institutional roots, through the Polemologisch Instituut in Groningen (since 1962), and that within that institute, they came to be interested also in peace education (a team for peace education was started as early as in 1968). A description of that work is given in the report, "Final Report of the Peace Education Working-Party" (Barthelds, Gerritsma & ter Veer, 1980). See further: Berg, 1986a.

Switzerland

Three letters are available in our collection from Switzerland: The official response formulated by "Centre Suisse de Documentation en Matière d'Enseignement et d'Education," Genève (letter 11); additional information from E.I.P., "Ecole Instrument de Paix" (letter 93); and from "Forum for Praxis-bezogene Friedensforschung," Basel (letter 120).

The official reply emphasizes that it is difficult to answer generally for Switzerland, as there actually is not one school system in the country but rather 26 different school systems, corresponding to the number of Cantons, which are fully independent in

school questions. Peace education and education for international understanding exists, however, as a feature in different subjects, such as religion, history and social studies. The teachers are free to handle peace questions as they find it appropriate. In recent years, different teacher organizations have been involved in the subject and have discussed it in various journals. A number of documents are appended, that exhibit this discussion in the educational press and in courses and seminars on peace education.

The Swiss UNESCO Commission acted as arranger for a seminar on peace education in 1985, which has recently been reviewed in a book ("Seminaire 'Education à la Paix', Rapport Final" (1986). The report contains a number of discourses on the peace-education theme.

An important organization in Switzerland is "Association Mondiale Ecole Instrument de Paix," whose founder Jacques Mühlethaler has, among other things, tried to influence the authors of history books to devote more space to peace questions and less to descriptions of war. He has produced special material for peace-oriented education, as well. A news-bulletin entitled "Ecole et Paix" is published in Genève by this organization.

Another interesting group in this connection is "Forum für Praxisbezogene Friedensforschung", which pursues certain peace research and functions as an information center for peace questions of interest to peace education. A current book from this group is "Handbuch Frieden Schweiz" (1986), with statements from different peace groups and peace movements in Switzerland. (See further: Svensson, 1988.)

The North American States and Provinces

In the United States and Canada, school issues are not controlled federally, but, rather, are handled mainly by the Departments of Education in the individual states and provinces. Accordingly, our questionnaire has gone out to these individual governmental units. When our analysis was made, replies had been received from 43 states of the U.S.A. and from 12 Canadian provinces and territories.

These answers from the U.S.A. have come from the following states: Alaska, Arizona, Arkansas, California, Colorado, Connecticut, Delaware, Florida, Georgia, Idaho, Indiana, Kansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Maine, Massachusetts, Michigan, Minnesota, Mississippi, Missouri, Montana, Maryland, Nebraska, Nevada, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, North Carolina, North Dakota, Ohio, Oklahoma, Oregon, Pennsylvania, Rhode Island, South Carolina, South Dakota, Texas, Utah, Virginia, Washington, West Virginia, Wisconsin and Wyoming.[1)]

The Canadian replies have come from: Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, New Foundland, Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia, Ontario, Prince Edward Island, Quebec, Saskatchewan and The Yukon Territory.

In Box 10, a summary is given of the response distribution on the main questions concerning the North American units, with separate information for the United States and Canada. Certain comparative figures for Europe have been added. We can verify a very low number of Yes-replies on Question 1. It is rare in both the U.S.A. and Canada that official recommendations are available in connection with peace education. Here there is a marked difference in relation to the European response group.

---

1) Later answers have also arrived from Alabama, Illinois and Tennessee, but too late to be included in the tables (cf. Appendix 1).

Also to Question 2, the North Americans answer Yes less often than do the responding countries in Europe. But the difference in this respect is not quite so great; there is a large supply of teaching material and guides not least in the U.S.A.

As to Question 3, there are no differences to speak of between the North American response group and the European. The ongoing debate on the possible contributions of the schools to peace education is obviously lively, also in the North American region.

That the share of Yes-answers is comparatively low on Questions 1 and 2 indicates that the content of the individual replies is necessarily less interesting since there has not been as much material to append, compared to the European response group. As before, however, I will take some examples from the individual replies in the following text, including Alberta (Canada), California (U.S.A.) and Michigan (U.S.A.).

Before I go on to these separate states, I want, nevertheless, to mention that I was also in contact with the federal authority of the United States (United States Department of Education in Washington, D.C.). In their reply (letter 78), they sent a number of current booklets on "global education" which can be considered to be a relevant educational perspective in this context (for example, "A Critical Review of the Short History of Global Education: Preparing for New Opportunities" by Wilard M. Kniep, 1985); they also sent a copy of a law (Public Law 98-525, 1984), which finally makes provision for the establishment of the long discussed "United States Institute of Peace". Some notes on this below may perhaps be of interest.

In this law, it is verified that a national, independent institute shall be established to further international peace and the settlement of international conflicts through non-violent methods, with the help of research, education and the circulation of information.

Box 10.

The response distribution on the international questionnaire's main questions, for the North American states and provinces (and some comparisons with Europe)

	Yes	No	Other answer
Question 1			
Canada (12)	2	6	4
United States (43)	4	34	5
Total (55)	6	40	9
Percent Yes/No	13%	87%	
(Europe)	(67%)	(33%)	
Question 2			
Canada (12)	2	5	5
United States (43)	22	17	4
Total (55)	24	22	9
Percent Yes/No	52%	48%	
(Europe)	(76%)	(24%)	
Question 3			
Canada (12)	4	3	5
United States (43)	27	9	7
Total (55)	31	12	12
Percent Yes/No	72%	28%	
(Europe)	(77%)	(23%)	

Note:

1. The formulation of the questions has been given above (see Box 2).
2. The percentages have been calculated on low numbers and must therefore be interpretated with caution.

The tasks of the institute are described in the following way:

> "(3) conduct research and make studies, particularly of an interdisciplinary... nature, into the causes of war and other international conflicts and the elements of peace among the nations and peoples of the world, ... and into the experiences of the United States and other nations in resolving conflicts with justice and dignity and without violence...
> (4) develop programs to make international peace and conflict resolution research, education, and training more available and useful... including the creation of handbooks...
> (5) provide, promote, and support peace education and research programs at graduate and postgraduate levels;
> (6) conduct training, symposia, and continuing education programs...
> (7) develop, for publication or other public communication, and disseminate, the carefully selected products of the Institute;
> (8) establish a clearinghouse and other means for disseminating information..."
> (United States Institute of Peace Act, 1984, sec. 1705.)

According to Letter 78, the Congress has set aside $4,000,000 for the initial planning of the institute, but it is expected that these preparations will be delayed somewhat because of the economic situation.

Alberta, Canada

In the response from Alberta, it is pointed out that peace education is covered by written instructions, not as a separate subject, but as a part of "social studies". The instructions for that subject contain in addition prescribed and recommended teaching aids, including material connected with questions on war and peace.

Excerpts from "Canadian Education Index" were sent along with the response from Alberta. This material indicates that discussion of peace education has been carried on in the educational periodicals.

The Alberta Teachers' Association puts out an educational periodical called "The ATA Magazine". A special issue has been published with the heading,

"The Nuclear Threat - An Issue for the Classroom". In this, there are article headings such as "How Can Teachers Remain Silent?", "Nuclear Awareness in the School", and "Peace Education: A Must for All Students".

Let me conclude with a quotation from Alberta educator Terry Carson, who writes in this special issue under the heading, "Compelling Reasons for Breaking the Silence", that the official demand for "objective balance" can easily have a paralyzing impact on the treatment of nuclear build-up problems:

"What are the schools doing? Again the question is raised as to how Alberta educators should address the situation of living in the shadow of a growing threat of nuclear war. ... This questioning comes from a basic concern about children and the future of the world, and it is itself both an expression of hope and an active search for renewed hope in a time when the possibility of a sudden and senseless ending to life is very real.

But as far these individual educators have had little opportunity to engage in a dialogue about the nuclear issue with other teachers or their students. The reason for this is that the nuclear question has been officially interpreted as a controversial issue ... Provincial guidelines state that because there is no consensus on them, controversial issues must be approached objectively by 'giving equal weight and sensitivity to all points of view'. I would not suggest that these provincial guidelines should be ignored..., but focusing on the controversial nature of an issue is not in itself the neutral act it seems to be. Insisting that we fix on this aspect first obscures the real significance that the question holds for the lives of educators and children. We need to question this definition of the issue and ask to what extent does an insistance on objectivity preserve the alienating silence about the nuclear issue in most Alberta classrooms?...

Obviously, teachers must deal with the issue with sensitivity and knowledge. This calls for conversation and some preparatory work among educators. But we should not be afraid to begin our conversation with our concerns as teachers and citizens of a community - to risk naming our fears and beginning from there." (Carson, 1984, p. 22, 25.)

California, U.S.A.

In the response from the California State Department of Education (letter 56), No was marked on the first main question, that is, there is no official text with recommendations concerning peace education. However, it is interesting that the California Department of Education, via a legal decision, had been commissioned to investigate the desirability of recommendations for a "nuclear age education". Assembly Bill, No. 3848 (1984), states:

"This bill would require the State Department of Education to collect information on current efforts of school districts to provide nuclear age education, and other information relevant to the development of a model nuclear age education curriculum and to report its findings and recommendations to the Legislature..."

The background of this assembly bill is presented as follows (Section 51755):

"(b) Current research has demonstrated that many of our children today fear the prospect of nuclear war, and it is now recognized that their frequent lack of motivation, particularly in school, is substantially influenced by further fears that there will be no future for themselves, their families, their communities, and their nation.

(c) Some polls have shown that the majority of high school students believe that nuclear war in the next decade is inevitable.

(d) If left unchecked, this lack of motivation and the feelings of helplessness could prove to be as devastating to American society as war itself."

Against this background, the California State Department of Education is entrusted with a three-part mandate (Section 51757):

"(a) The State Department of Education shall conduct a survey to review current efforts of school districts to provide nuclear-age education.

(b) The department shall also collect other information relevant to the development of a model nuclear-age education curriculum, including... reports of educational organizations, scientific groups, and psychologists regarding the effects of the nuclear age upon children.

(c) The department shall also seek information from concerned parents, teachers, students, and members of the community regarding whether and how a nuclear-age educational curriculum should be developed..."

In addition, the letter from the California Department of Education contained examples of recommendations for classes in history and social science, where the question of nuclear weapons is more concisely discussed, together with selected references to textbooks and manuals concentrating on peace problems and nuclear war. The latter list was not compiled in California but by well known sources elsewhere, for example, by Educators for Social Responsibility in Cambridge, Massachusetts.

The analysis required by the Assembly Bill has since been carried out and is presented in a report, "Nuclear Age Education" (1986). The recommendations are summarized in Box 11.

Box 11.

Summary of recommendations from "Nuclear Age Education" (1986, p. 2)

Recommendations on Nuclear Age Education

The Department believes that the following recommendations constitute the best method to help make nuclear age education available in California's public schools. The recommendations are based on the data secured from statewide surveys and a review of the literature on nuclear age education, which are included in the body of the report.

The Legislature should provide resources for the State Department of Education to:

A. Develop a series of in-service education activities for teachers, administrators, and parents to:

1. Increase personal awareness of attitudes commonly reflected in the student survey and appropriate responses to such attitudes.
2. Build skills in teaching critical thinking and conflict resolution and in allowing for increasingly sophisticatd analytical approaches to the nuclear age issues.

3. Provide access to age-appropriate resources, curricula, lesson plans, and alternative approaches to incorporating nuclear age education in existing curricula.

B. Continue to include and to increase the coverage of nuclear age topics in publications--such as frameworks, model curriculum standards, model curriculum guidelines, and handbooks--in all appropriate subject areas: for example, history, social science, science, literature, expository writing, the arts, and mathematics.

C. Work with all concerned community, civic, and public-interest groups to ensure a balanced, unbiased process for making nuclear age education part of the curriculum, which will result in a better informed, responsible, and responsive parent-teacher-student cooperative effort.

The Legislature should encourage school districts to:

A. Provide release time and appropriate opportunities for teachers and administrators to receive in-service training in nuclear age education, as described above.

B. Incorporate nuclear age instruction in all subject areas already in the curriculum, as appropriate, including history, social science, science, literature, expository writing, the arts, and mathematics. Instruction should be integrated in appropriate topics, and the content should be adjusted to fit the maturity of the students. Such age-appropriate instruction should include critical thinking in the nuclear age, conflict resolution, and increasingly sophisticated understanding of the decision-making processes surrounding nuclear age issues.

C. Involve parent, community, and public-interest groups in both in-service training and curriculum development to ensure a balanced, unbiased approach at the local level to meet the needs of students and teachers, as expressed in this report.

2

Michigan, U.S.A.

In the response from the Michigan State Department of Education (letter 35), it is emphasized that the final responsibility for what is taken up on the different educational levels is deferred to the local school districts. However, this does not hinder the state authorities from also presenting guiding redommendations. In Michigan, the area of peace training has most often come under the label "global education/ global issues".

For a start, there are certain general viewpoints in a short booklet called "The Common Goals in Michigan Education" (which first came out in 1971 and is now before us in a revised edition from 1980). Within this booklet there is, among other things, a four-page listing of goals for the students' learning, from which point four can be cited. As a result of the studies, each student should:

> "4. acquire the knowledge, skills, and attitudes needed for effective participation in a pluralistic, interdependent, global society.
> a) acquire the knowledge about persistent global issues such as the food, population, and energy problems,
> b) understand and appreciate the interrelatedness of local and national problems with those confronting the global society,
> c) develop skills and attitudes for effective communication and cooperation with people from cultures different from their own both at home and abroad." (P. 7.)

In addition, there is a pamphlet with recommendations referring particularly to the global perspectives in education ("Guidelines for Global Education"). A quotation from the opening description of the goals and their realization can give a picture of what is referred to (pp. 6-7):

> "Global education in a school system will equip the student with an understanding and an awareness of global interdependence by providing encouragement and opportunity to:
> A. Acquire a basic knowledge of various aspects of the world: geographic, cultural, racial, linguistic, economic, political, historical, artistic, scientific, and religious.

B. Develop a personal value and behavior system based on a global perspective, particularly as it relates to aspects listed above.
C. Understand problems and potential problems that have global implications.
D. Explore solutions for global problems.
E. Develop a practical way of life based on global perspectives.
F. Plan for alternative futures.
G. Participate responsibly in an interdependent world.

In order to accomplish these goals, a school system should provide both cognitive and affective experiences such as:

...
D. A study of various social, political, and economic systems from a non-ethnocentric standpoint.
...
I. A study of the global implications of natural disasters.
J. Encounters with artistic expressions of other cultural groups.
K. Involvement in scientific studies from a global perspective.
L. Awareness of instances of the denial of human rights.
...
P. Resolution strategies for resolving personal, intergroup, and international conflicts.
...
R. Participation in people-to-people exchange programs.
S. Person-to-person contacts with official and unofficial representatives of other countries.
T. Participation in community programs with a global orientation."

In addition, there are recommendations for individual school subjects. Of most interest in this case is "Essential Performance Objectives for Social Studies", where a more detailed goal-catalogue is given, with sections for different grade levels (K-3, 4-6, 7-9).

Examples of Individual Institutions and Organizations

Even if the school system is steered at the state/provincial level, a great deal of the development of ideas and teaching materials, etc., in North America is done by individual institutions and organizations with considerable influence across state and provincial borders. When the different states/provinces in the U.S.A. and Canada give examples of important teaching materials or guide-lines in the peace education field,

they often refer to material from other geographic areas than their own. The borders between the political units do not mean so much, even that between Canada and the United States. I will give a few examples of institutions and organizations which work this way.

Some of the organizations have an international character. Here we find IPRA, the "International Peace Research Association", which in principle is worldwide, but has had its headquarters in the U.S.A. (at Mershon Center, Ohio State University, Columbus). Their detailed news-bulletin ("International Peace Research Newsletter") has been edited by Elise Boulding of the University of Colorado. There is a special group for peace education within IPRA.[1)]

Various groups of professionals focusing attention on peace questions and resistance to nuclear weapons, play an important role in the development of teaching material and in the exchange of information. One such group is "Educators for Social Responsibility", who have their headquarters in Cambridge, Massachusetts. This group has, among other things, compiled "Perspectives: A Teaching Guide to Concepts of Peace" (1983), which is often mentioned in responses from individual states. This rather extensive material (about 400 pages) is made up of three sections: (1) An introductory section with discussions of principles for peace-related education; (2) Exercises for students in the lower grades, from pre-school through the sixth grade; (3) Exercises for students in the upper grades, seven through twelve.

Among the active professional groups we may also note "Psychologists for Social Responsibility" (with headquarters in Washington, D.C.), who act as an information center for psychologists interested in peace education and the psychological effects of the threat of nuclear weapons. A bibliography covering this area has been put together by the organization's California branch. Also the "Union of Concerned Scientists" has

---

[1)] In 1987, the headquarters of IPRA moved to Rio de Janeiro, Brazil.

involved itself in the development of teaching materials by compiling, together with the Massachusetts Teacher Association and the National Education Association, "Choices: A Unit on Conflict and Nuclear War" (1983), "Choices..." is a study package with the intention of initiating discussion on conflict, war and nuclear war. The material has gone through a relatively thorough trial period, with the first version field-tested by teachers across 34 states. Furthermore, substantial informative work has been carried out by "Physicians for Social Responsibility". A well known representative is Dr. Helen Caldicott who, among many other things, has collaborated in an often-used film produced by the Canadian National Film Board: "If You Love This Planet."

A number of institutions work with spreading information and/or developing teaching materials for people involved in peace-oriented education. I will content myself with mentioning only a few. Well known is "Global Perspectives in Education", New York, which has worked for years with internationalizing education and peace questions. They have worked out a series of guidelines for education. They function as a center for information, partly through their information bulletin, "Access", and partly through various collections in monographic form (for example, "The Global Resource Book", 1986). Also in New York is the well known "World Policy Institute", which works especially from the concept of "world order". Their publication "Peace and World Order Studies" is a worthwhile source of information (the fourth edition in published with Barbara J. Wein as editor). There is abundant information within the 700 well-filled pages on various university courses about peace questions and global problems. In St. Louis, Missouri, there is "The Institute for Peace and Justice", publisher of, among other things, the extensive work, "Educating for Peace and Justice" (McGinnis, 1984-85).

The United States has also been a base for a number of organizations with international exchange as their program. In 1951 the American psychologist Doris Allen started an international children's program with peace education intentions, "Children's International Summer Villages" (CISV), which is still quite active, and which has attracted interest also from researchers (cf., for example, Bjerstedt, 1958; Ekman, et al., 1970; Lindstein, 1975).

A related but newer organization is "International School-to-School Experience" (ISSE), which promotes school contacts across national boundaries. Its international headquarters is in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.

It would take too long to describe all of the institutions and organizations in this field, but it could be of interest to mention (and place) a few more, such as "Arms Control Association" (Washington, D.C.), "Canadian Peace Research Institute" (Oakville, Ontario), "Center for Teaching International Relations" (Denver, Colorado), "Consortium on Peace, Research, Education and Development" ("COPRED"; Urbana, Illinois), "United Nations Institute for Training and Research" (New York City) and "Worldwatch Institute" (Washington, D.C.).

If one studies individual organizations and institutions interested in peace questions in the United States and Canada, one gets an impression of great activity and many worthwhile contributions. In comparison with this, the official school system's interest in peace questions can appear slight. Here, there is a certain contradiction, where those who are interested in peace questions and peace education risk being regarded by the general public and the establishment as odd or politically adventurous (conceptions which are mirrored in such jargon as "peaceniks" and "pinkos"). Nevertheless, it can be said that the past years' debate on the threat of nuclear weapons, as reflected in dramatic TV programs, has indicated a

broadened involvement. It is no longer only academic "eggheads" and people on the political left who question nuclear build-up.

Other Non-European Nations

Other non-European countries constitute a heterogeneous group, within which peace education questions have not often been especially topical (clearly seen in the earlier tables). The pattern of response, No-No-No on our three main questions has not been unusual. I choose to illustrate this heterogeneous group with some notes on two states: Israel and New Zealand.

Israel

Nowadays in Israel there are certain recommendations about peace education, some teaching materials and ongoing attempts to further develop this field. A limited amount of discussion is being carried on; one objection is: "Can we educate for peace when our country is still in conflict with several Arab states?"

In fact, the situation is in many respects very special in Israel. A good picture of the problems and educational contributions towards solving some of these, is given in a report from the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute entitled, "A Comprehensive Educational Programme on Arab-Jewish and Arab-Israeli Relations" (1985), written by Alouph Hareven. Here are some of the main ideas in this report:

The paper discusses three difficult problems which are intertwined. The first concerns the present complex relations between Jews and Arabs within Israel, and between Israel as a nation and the neighboring Arab states. The second concerns the attitudes of the Israelis, and of the young people in particular, towards this reality. The third involves the interesting questions, for us, about whether the schools should attempt to make educational contributions in this context, how the goals for such a contribution should be formulated, and which methods should be employed.

Over the years, the relations between Jews and Arabs could be characterized by one keyword: conflict. For example, in the mid-sixties we saw an almost complete polarization and closed borders. Now in the mid-eighties, however, Hareven implies that the actual situation is not as clearcut. Acute conflict still characterizes the relation with certain states such as Syria, Iraq and Libya as well as with the PLO. A somewhat less hostile atmosphere prevails in the relations with other states such as Morocco, Jordan and Tunisia. In principle, however, peaceful relations prevail with Egypt since 1979. Even if there are critical viewpoints about the genuineness of this peace, direct communication on common questions is maintained continuously, and the borders are open for tourism, which is taken advantage of by the Israelis especially. About 650,000 Arabs are Israeli citizens with the same legal rights in principle. The approximately 1,25 million Arabs who live in territories occupied by Israel since 1967, represent a special problem. The majority of these Arabs are naturally not pleased with this state of affairs. At the same time, various sorts of relationships have developed even here between Arabs and Jews with the passage of time.

Thus, the actual situation has changed in recent years, from total conflict and separation to a condition which is differentiated, complex and ambiguous. From a psychological angle, this state of affairs can be more difficult to deal with than the earlier uncomplicated, black-and-white antagonism. Now, an Arab can be many things, not only a mortal enemy.

In his analysis, Hareven is of the opinion that there are indications that many Israelis lag twenty years behind, in their perception of the relationship between the Arabs and the Israelis. They perceive the situation to be as it was twenty years ago. The prevailing ambiguity creates uncertainty. Among the young people, there are often strong negative attitudes against the

Arabs within their own country; we find many stereotyped opinions based on fear. According to opinion polls, extreme attitudes (of the type: all Arabs must leave Israeli territory) are not uncommon among young people.

Prior to the eighties, the Israeli educational system barely paid attention to these questions. In 1981, however, Israel set up a commission made up primarily of members from the Ministry of Education, which was to examine the possibilities to work educationally with relations between Arabs and Jews. The commission published a report in 1983 ("Guidelines on Education for Co-existence"), and the Van Leer Jerusalem Institute was commissioned to start a range of educational activities, aiming to implement the program.

Three aims have been set up for the project: (1) to develop an understanding for equal rights for Jews and Arabs in Israel; (2) to train for life within a multicultural society with respect for the disparate members; (3) to develop a more realistic and differentiated picture of the relations between Israel and the Arab states.

The Israelis involved are working on a wide front with these tasks and are doing so in four principal ways.

One way is to develop teaching materials and guidelines for school activities that can mean a step in the right direction. With respect to this, a program is included, which tries to encourage mutual contacts between Jewish and Arabic neighboring communities, in cooperation with Jewish and Arabic teachers.

A second way is to work with continued education for teachers; by no means an easy task, as many teachers are ambivalent towards the tasks and would rather avoid them, while others openly endorse racist attitudes. An experiment is included with structured get-togethers between Jewish and Arabic teachers, in an attempt to

get them to know one another, to train communicating with each other and to jointly discuss professional problems. For many of these teachers, it has been the first time they could meet in this way, on equal terms.

A third way is to produce a bi-lingual TV series, attractive to the general public but at the same time with the educational purpose of shedding light on the mutual relations between Arabs and Jews in a modulated and prejudice-neutralizing way.

Finally, a fourth way is to encourage Arab and Jewish authors to write books for children and young people on relationships between the two peoples.

The author of the report gives an interesting description of these developments, which demonstrate that people in Israel are now trying seriously to get to work on these difficult relationship problems with educational and psychological methods. Naturally it is too early to judge the possibilities of success of this undertaking, in an area where so many powerful forces are working in other directions. It is made clear by the report that the Ministry of Education has played a somewhat "two-faced" role. They have joined in initiating all of this, but have since chosen on the whole to hand over the responsibility to an external institution, the institution which put together the report referred to here. To turn over responsibility in this way to an institution removed from government circles, can have a certain value in the initial phase, in creating flexibility; but in the long run, Hareven thinks, the Ministry must take the responsibility to see that proposed measures are actually imcorporated into the regular educational system.

New Zealand

As indicated in the material sent from New Zealand (letter 67), the situation of peace-oriented education has changed there in recent years. Very little official

encouragement had been given earlier; isolated, individually interested teachers were the only driving force. In recent years, various peace groups have become more active and are working to encourage the schools to contribute more towards peace education. The change in government in 1984 also meant a change in policy. Foreign-relations-wise, we can note the support for a nuclear-weapons-free zone and for prohibiting nuclear armed or driven ships from entering New Zealand's harbors. In educational politics, we can also see a changed attitude: they now want to legitimize and support peace education.

We find a description of this development in an article entitled "The Politics of Peace Education" written by Clive McGee and published in the Social Studies Observer in November, 1985. Towards the end of 1984, the new Minister of Education called a planning meeting for peace education, followed by a three-day conference in early 1985 for teachers from different grade levels, as well as representatives from various peace groups.

The conference led to a political debate in the parliament, where representatives of the opposition questioned this new initiative, which they interpreted as an attempt at indoctrination ("Will the individual views of individual teachers be hammered down the throats of some young people?"). The Minister of Education replied that it was not a question of indoctrination but a duty for the schools to take responsibility for giving the young people an opportunity to involve themselves in today's controversial questions ("For too long we have been blessed by people who have said that if a matter is controversial it should be left alone"). The Department of Education has now given the green light for development work within this field, and four regional work groups have begun to look over the aims, methods and materials for peace-oriented education.

Some preliminary guidelines have been compiled within the department ("Guidelines for Peace Studies", 1986). By way of introduction, they assert that (p. 3):

"Peace studies give insights into developing self-esteem, mutual trust, constructive ways of resolving conflict and concern for the environment. - It is a process of learning and teaching which can infuse all subjects of the curriculum at all ages."

The more specific goals are described thus (p. 4):

"Peace studies help people to:
develop positive attitudes to their own worth, and to the needs and values of others,
develop sensitivity towards other life-styles and cultures,
understand causes of conflict in individuals, families, groups, societies and the world,
develop skills in identifying and solving problems using non-violent ways of handling conflict,
understand the interdependence of all living systems and the responsibility of caring for the environment,
explore alternative futures and to develop adequate social and political structures to meet the challenges for a more just and peaceful world."

Concerning the means of attack, they point out that it is important to start with the learners, their experiences and perceptions. The contents must be adapted to their needs and conceptions. The choice of focus will vary; certain learning activities ought to concentrate on the personal and interpersonal levels, while other activities will concentrate on social and global issues.

It is essential, at the same time, that the school, in its organization and function, should reflect peace education principles. The teachers ought to encourage the students' participation in planning and decision-making, as well as their critical thinking and sensitivity to the points of view of others, especially when dealing with controversial issues.

A large number of reports and articles have been compiled in New Zealand within the peace education field. Many can be ordered from the New Zealand Foundation for Peace Studies, C.P.O., Box 4110, Auckland 1, N.Z.

CONCLUSION

The international questionnaire on peace-oriented education in different countries gave abundant and diverse material. Many of the responses contained comprehensive text documentation in the form of articles, books and reports, It has not been totally problem-free to give the reader a description of this material in a manner which would give both an overview and a certain amount of concrete substance. I have tried my best to solve this problem, partly by giving a general picture, based to some extent on simple numerical summaries (in the first part of the report); and partly by giving more concrete notes on the more specific situations in certain groups of countries and individual states (in the second part of the report). However, this method of working has meant that I could not, in this paper, make full use of all materials received. Therefore, when time and opportunity allow, I plan to come back with more detailed information about certain countries and groups of countries.

REFERENCES

Ankarstrand-Lindström, G. Skolelevers upplevelser av framtid och skola: Enkätdata. Pedagogisk-psykologiska problem, No. 432, 1984.

Askeland, M. Fredsundervisning. Skolens årbok 1984. Cc. 8415-8430.

Baltzersen, J., Pøhler, T. & Projektet Fredsberedskap. Lära för fred: Samtal med representanter för "Lærere for fred" i Danmark. Särtryck och småtryck, No. 572, 1987.

Barthelds, C.H.M., Gerritsma, H.B. & ter Veer, B.J.T. Final report of the Peace Education Working-Party. Groningen: Polemologisch Instituut, 1980.

Becker, J.M. Teaching about nuclear disarmament. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappa Educational Foundation, 1985.

Berg, M. Fredsundervisning i Nederländerna. Särtryck och småtryck, No. 551, 1986. (a)

Berg, M. Krig och fred i klassen: Några teman från en världskonferens om pedagogik för fred. Särtryck och småtryck, No. 533, 1986. (b)

Billesbølle, P. et al. Børns angst for krig med kernevåben. Ugeskrift for læger, 1986, 148, 731-734.

Bjerstedt, Å. Reduction of "barrier tendencies" during experience of international co-living: Psychological control studies of certain aspects in the CISV socio-educational approach. Acta psychologica, 1958, 13, 329-346.

Bjerstedt, Å. Lära för fred. Stockholm: Skolöverstyrelsen, 1985.

Bjerstedt, Å. Fredsorienterade skolaktiviteter: Några glimtar från debatt och FoU i Sverige. Särtryck och småtryck, No. 530, 1986. (a)

Bjerstedt, Å. Peace education today and tomorrow. Educational and Psychological Interactions, No. 85, 1986. (b)

Bjerstedt, Å. Peace education: Towards specification of educational objectives. Reprints and Miniprints, No. 554, 1986. (c)

Bjerstedt, Å. Approaching a "preparedness for peace": Notes on a research and development project. Educational and Psychological Interactions, No. 90, 1987.

Bjerstedt, Å. & Gustafsson, E. (Eds.) Towards peace education (II): Abstracts on some reports related to conflict resolution and peace education, 1976-1986. Pedagogisk dokumentation, No. 81, 1986.

Bjerstedt, Å., Gustafsson, E. & Rosenqvist, J. (Eds.) På väg mot icke-våldsberedskap och världsmedborgaransvar: En samling korta litteraturreferat. Pedagogisk dokumentation, No. 85, 1987.

Bjerstedt, Å. & Rodhe, B. (Eds.) Internationell förståelse och internationellt medansvar som utbildningsmål. Pedagogisk-psykologiska problem, No. 99, 1969.

Bjurwill, C. Framtidsföreställningar: Analys och tolkning av 900 elevers uppsatser och semantiska skattningar. (Studia psychologica et paedagogica 84.) Malmö: Liber, 1986.

Blekastad, B. (Ed.) Fredsundervisning. (Special issue of:) Forsøksnytt (Oslo), 1982, 13(4-5).

Brock-Utne, B. Education for peace: A feminist perspective. Oxford: Pergamon Press, 1985.

Carson, T. Compelling reasons for breaking the silence. The ATA Magazine, 1984, 64(3), 22-25.

Choices: A unit on conflict and nuclear war. (A project of Union of Concerned Scientists in cooperation with Massachusetts Teachers Association and National Education Association.) Washington, DC: NEA, 1983.

Churchill, S. & Omari, I. Evaluation of the Unesco Associated Schools Project in education for international co-operation and peace. Paris: Unesco, 1981.

The common goals in Michigan education. Lansing, MI: Michigan State Board of Education, 1980.

Crump, G.F. (Ed.) Peace education: Guidelines for primary and secondary schools. Bristol: Education Department, 1983.

Curle, A., Freire, P. & Galtung, J. What can education contribute towards peace and social justice? In: Haavelsrud, M. (Ed.) Education for peace. Guildford, Surrey: IPC Science and Technology Press, 1976. Pp. 64-97.

Davies, R. Children and the threat of nuclear war. (CPS Occasional Paper 8.) Lancaster: Centre for Peace Studies, 1984.

Dikawar, R.R. & Agrawal, M. (Eds.) Peace education. (Special issue, Gandhi Marg.) New Delhi: Gandhi Peace Foundation, 1984.

Duczek, S. Peace studies - The Atlantic College experience. (WSDS/11.) Heslington, York: World Studies Teacher Training Centre, n.d.

Educating for peace through geography. Bristol: Avon Peace Education Project, 1984.

Educating for peace through social education. Bristol: Avon Peace Education Project, 1984.

Educational journals published in the German Democratic Republic devoted to peace education. Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1984.

Education Committee, Newcastle upon Tyne. Nuclear issues in education: A teaching guide. Newcastle upon Tyne: Pendower Hall Teachers' Centre, n.d.

Education for peace, international understanding and respect for human rights through teaching of ethical and humanistic values in the German Democratic Republic. Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1985.

Education for peace resources. Sheffield: Westbourne Teachers' Centre, 1984.

Education for peace, security, détente and disarmament, for international understanding and cooperation and with respect to human rights and fundamental freedoms in the German Democratic Republic. Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1983.

Ekman, B., Kahlin, K. & Lundberg, U. A study of the social structure of an International Children's Village. Scandinavian Journal of Educational Research, 1970, 14, 185-194.

EOS: Uppsatser och meddelanden utgivna av Svenska skolornas fredsförening. Stockholm: Eklund, 1927.

Essential performance objectives for social studies. Lansing, MI: Michigan State Board of Education, 1984.

Fakta om fredsfostran i DDR. Stockholm: DDR Kulturcentrum, n.d.

Fidock, A. Peace education - or education for peace. Woden, ACT: Curriculum Development Centre, 1985.

Finlands författningssamling (Helsingfors), No. 476, 1983.

Fisher, S. & Hicks, D. World studies 8-13: A teacher's handbook. Edinburgh: Oliver & Boyd, 1985.

Fredsarbeid i grunnskolen. (Grunnskolerådets informasjonshefte 32.) Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1986.

Fredsundervisning: Fred - frihet - utveckling - mänskliga rättigheter. Stockholm: Liber, 1985.

Fredsundervisning i skolan. Stockholm: Liber, 1985.

Friedenserziehung in der Schule. Düsseldorf: Der Kultusminister des Landes Nordrhein-Westfalen, 1985.

Friedenserziehung in der Schule - Überlegungen und Hinweise zur Information und Diskussion. Wiesbaden: Sonderdruck des Hessischen Kultusministers, 1983.

Gault, A.J. Development of a curriculum paradigm for international education. (Ed.D.) Philadelphia, PA: Temple University, 1985.

Gerritsma, H.B. (Ed.) Vredesonderwijs: Opvattingen en ervaringen. Utrecht: Vredesopbouw, 1985.

Gleichgewicht, Rüstungskontrolle, Abrüstung. (Materialien zum Unterricht, Sekundarstufe I - Heft 50.) Wiesbaden: Hessisches Institut für Bildungsplanung und Schulentwicklung, 1984.

The global resource book. New York: Global Perspectives in Education, 1986.

Grunderna för grundskolans läroplan. Helsingfors: Skolstyrelsen, 1985.

Grundsätze zur Friedenserziehung für Hamburger Schulen. Hamburg: Behörde für Schule und Berufsbildung, 1983.

Guidelines for global education. Lansing, MI: Michigan Department of Education, n.d.

Guidelines for peace studies. Wellington, N.Z.: New Zealand Department of Education, 1986.

Haavelsrud, M. (Ed.) Approaching disarmament education. Guildford, Surrey: Westbury House, 1981.

Hansejordet, H. (Ed.) Skole for fred: Handbog i freds-pedagogik. Oslo: Det Norske Samlaget, 1982.

Hareven, A. A comprehensive educational programme on Arab-Jewish and Arab-Israeli relations. Jerusalem: The Van Leer Jerusalem Institute, 1985.

Helenius, S., Ollila, K. & Pitkänen, M. Rauhankasvatuskirjallisuus 1970-1983. /Peace education bibliography./ Jyväskylä: Pedagogiska forskningsinstitutet, n.d. (1983.)

Hicks, D.W. Teaching nuclear issues. Lancaster: Centre for Peace Studies, 1986.

Jensen, J.P. & Keldorff, S. (Eds.) Fredsundervisning - psykologi og paedagogik til fredsarbejdet. Copenhagen: Nordisk Forlag, 1984.

Kniep, W.M. A critical review of the short history of global education: Preparing for new opportunities. New York: Global Perspectives in Education, 1985.

Kuhlmann, C. Peace - A topic in European history textbooks? Frankfurt am Main: Verlag Peter Lang, 1985.

Lassen, P. Fredsundervisning. København: Undervisningsministeriets tidsskrift Uddannelse, 1983.

Lessons before midnight: Educating for reason in nuclear matters. (Bedford Way Papers 19.) London: Institute of Education, Univer. London, 1984.

Lindstein, T. Experiment i samlevnad. Del 1: Ideologiska konsekvenser av en internationell barnby. Stockholm: Pedag inst, 1975.

Lutz, D.S. (Ed.) Weder Wehrkunde noch Friedenserziehung? Baden-Baden: Nomos, 1984.

McGee, C. The politics of peace education. Social Studies Observer, 1985, 18(2), 30-34.

McGinnis, J. Educating for peace and justice. (I-II.) St. Louis, MO: The Institute for Peace and Justice, 1984-1985.

McGregor, F. Educación para la paz. Lima, Peru: ANES, 1985.

Myrdal, A. & The Project "Preparedness for the Future". Strengthening the readiness to create a better future: A conversation on disarmament, ethics, propaganda, utopias, and the school. Educational and Psychological Interactions, No. 72, 1980.

National Union of Teachers. Education for peace. London: NUT, 1984.

No more war and Fascism! Education of the young generation in the spirit of peace and social progress. Potsdam: International scientific symposium. National Commission for UNESCO of the German Democratic Republic, 1985.

Nuclear age education. Assembly Bill Number 3848. State of California, 1984.

Nuclear age education: A report to the legislature. Sacramento, CA: California State Department of Education, 1986.

Nuclear arms education in secondary schools. Muscatine, IA: The Stanley Foundation, 1985.

The nuclear threat: An issue for the classroom? Edmonton, Alberta: The ATA Magazine (Alberta Teachers' Association), 1984.

Oppdragelse til fred. /Special issue of:/ Norsk pedagogisk tidskrift, 1982, 66(5).

"Peace and security": 2-period optional subject in the upper secondary school. Oslo: Ministry of Church and Education, 1984.

Peace education. /Report compiled by the Peace Education Task Force./ Melbourne: Victorian Education Department, 1985.

Peace education: Guidelines for primary and secondary schools. Bristol: County of Avon Public Relations and Publicity Department, 1983.

Perspectives: A teaching guide to concepts of peace. Cambridge, MA: Educators for Social Responsibility, 1983.

Pikas, A. Fredsfostran: Studieförslag och utvecklingsaspekter. (2nd ed.) Stockholm: Skolöverstyrelsen, 1983.

Pikas, A. Fredsfostrans transferproblem. Kritisk Psykologi, 1985, 40(3/4), 10-33.

Pilkington, N. A critical examination of the growth, development, theory and practice of peace education in Britain. Bradford: Univer. Bradford, 1985.

Rathenow, H.-F. & Smoker, P. Peace education in Great Britain: Some results of a survey. Lancaster: The Richardson Institute for Conflict and Peace Research, n.d.

Raundalen, M. & Raundalen, T.S. Barn i atomåldern: Vad säger vi till barnen och vad säger barnen själva? Stockholm: Prisma, 1986.

Reich, B. & Weber, N.H. (Eds.) Unterricht im Dienste des Friedens. Düsseldorf: Schwann, 1984.

Report to the Education Committee of the Working Party on the Development of a Curriculum for Peace Education. Nottingham: Education Department, 1983.

Roberts, B. & Carson, T. (Eds.) Peace education. (Special issue of:) The History and Social Science Teacher (Canada), 1985, 20(3/4).

Rosenqvist, J. Undervisning i fredens tjänst: Västtysk diskussion av villkor och möjligheter i olika skolämnen. Särtryck och småtryck, No. 532, 1986.

Rosenqvist, J. Undervisning för fred och rättvisa: Några glimtar från en amerikansk lärarhandledning. Särtryck och småtryck, No. 566, 1987.

Röhrs, H. Frieden - eine pädagogische Aufgabe. Braunschweig: Agentur Pedersen, 1983.

Schools should give balanced view on peace and war: Sir Keith deplores attempts at indoctrination. (Press notice 32/84.) London: Department of Education and Science, 1984.

Schule und Friedenserziehung. Hannover: Niedersächsischer Kultusminister, 1983.

Seiring, W. Friedenserziehung in der Berliner Schule. Berlin: Landespressedienst, 1982.

Seminaire "Education à la paix": Rapport final. Berne: Commission Nationale Suisse pour l'Unesco, 1986.

Some curriculum implications for peace education. Nottingham: Education Department, 1983.

Spielmann, M. If peace comes...: The future expectations of Jewish and Arab Israeli children and youth. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell, 1984.

Svensson, S.E. Försvarskunskap eller fredsfostran? - Skolans roll i fredsfostringsarbetet enligt västtysk debatt. Särtryck och småtryck, No. 534, 1986.

Svensson, S.E. Fredsrörelse, fredsforskning om fredsfostran ur ett schweiziskt perspektiv. Särtryck och småtryck, Nr 592, 1988.

Thelin, B. Peace education: Peace - liberty - development - human rights. Stockholm: National Board of Education, 1986.

Thelin, B. & Projektet Fredsberedskap. Samtal om fredsundervisning i skolan. Särtryck och småtryck, No. 537, 1986.

Training of teachers for education concerning international cooperation, understanding, peace and disarmament. /Workshop report./ Prague: Ministry of Education of the Czech Socialist Republic, 1985.

Tubb, C. (Ed.) Peace education. /Special issue of:/ Cambridge Journal of Education, 1987, 17(1).

United States Institute of Peace Act. Washington, DC: Public Law 98-525, Oct. 19, 1984.

Wahlström, R. An enemy image as a psychological antecedent of warfare and armament. (Congress paper.) Helsinki: European Psychologists for Peace, 1986.

Was ist Frieden? Handreichung zur Behandling des Themas „Frieden" im Unterricht, I-II. München: Staatsinstitut für Schulpädagogik und Bildungsforschung, 1983-84.

Wesołowska, E.A. Research report of the Institute for School Curricula of the Ministry of Education undertaken in the context of the Unesco Joint Study of "Education for International Understanding, Cooperation and Peace and Education Relating to Human Rights and Fundamental Freedoms through the Teaching of Ethical and Humanistic Values" 1983-1984. Warsaw: Ministry of Education, 1984.

Wesołowska, E.A. Education for peace in the Polish educational system. Warsaw: Ministry of Education & Polish Interpress Agency, 1986.

Who's who in peace education? Avon Peace Education Journal, 1984/85, 3(2).

Wien, B.J. (Ed.) Peace and world order studies: A curriculum guide. (4th ed.) New York: World Policy Institute, 1984.

Yarwood, R. & Weaver, T. (Eds.) Peace education and education for peace. (PEP Talk 11.) London: Peace Education Project, Peace Pledge Union, 1986.

Young, N. The contemporary peace education movement in Britain. Oslo: Peace Research Institute, 1984.

Zola, J. & Zola, J. (Eds.) Teaching about peace and nuclear war. Boulder, CO: Social Science Education Consortium, 1985.

Zum Beitrag der Lehrpläne und Schulbücher für Geschichte und Staatsbürgerkunde sowie für andere Fächer zur Erziehung der Schuljugend im Geiste des Friedens, der Abrüstung, der internationalen Verständigung und Achten der Menschenrechte in der DDR. Berlin: Volk und Wissen, 1982.

OVERVIEW OF QUESTIONNAIRES DISTRIBUTED AND REPLIES RECEIVED

Group A:

Answers arrived up to Nov. 6, 1986 (n=121)

Alaska
Alberta
Arizona
Arkansas
Australian Capital Territory
Austria
Avon
Baden-Württemberg
Bayern
Belgium: Flemish region
Belgium: French region
Berlin
Birmingham
Brazil
Bremen
British Columbia
California
Chile
Colorado
Connecticut
Costa Rica
Cyprus
Czechoslovakia
DDR
Delaware
Denmark
Finland
Florida
France
Georgia
Greece
Hamburg
Hessen
Iceland
Idaho
India
Indiana
Inner London
Ireland
Israel
Japan
Kansas
Kentucky
Leeds
Leicestershire
Liechtenstein
Louisiana
Luxembourg
Maine
Manchester
Manitoba
Maryland

Massachusetts
Michigan
Minnesota
Mississippi
Missouri
Montana
Nebraska
The Netherlands
Nevada
New Brunswick
Newcastle upon Tyne
New Foundland
New Hampshire
New Jersey
New South Wales
New York
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Niedersachsen
Nordrhein-Westfalen
North Carolina
North Dakota
Northern Australia
Northern Ireland
Northwest Territories
Norway
Nottinghamshire
Nova Scotia
Ohio
Oklahoma
Ontario
Oregon
Pakistan
Pennsylvania
Peru
Poland
Portugal
Prince Edward Island
Quebec
Rheinland-Pfalz
Rhode Island
Saarland
Saskatchewan
Schleswig-Holstein
Scotland
Sheffield
South Australia
South Carolina
South Dakota
Soviet Union
Spain
Sweden
Switzerland
Tanzania
Tasmania
Texas

Turkey
Utah
Victoria
Virginia
Wales
Washington
Western Australia
West Virginia
Wisconsin
Wyoming
Yugoslavia
The Yukon
Zimbabwe

Group B:

Questionnaires distributed but not answered Nov. 6, 1986 (n=20)

*Alabama
Albania
* Argentina
Bulgaria
China
Egypt
Hawaii
Hungary
*Illinois
Iowa
Italy
Kenya
*Liverpool
Malta
New Mexico
Queensland
Roumania
*Tennessee
*The Vatican
*Vermont

The addressees marked by * have replied after Nov. 6, 1986; too late to be included in the tables of this report.

CONTENTS

BACKGROUND	3
THE INTERNATIONAL QUESTIONNAIRE	6
SOME GENERAL CHARACTERISTIC FEATURES OF THE RESPONSE MATERIAL	10
PEACE-ORIENTED ACTIVITIES IN THE SCHOOL: ILLUSTRATIVE NOTES FROM DIFFERENT COUNTRIES	23
The Nordic Countries	24
The British Isles	33
The West German States	42
Other Countries of Europe	48
The North American States and Provinces	59
Other Non-European Nations	73
CONCLUSION	79
REFERENCES	80
APPENDIX	87